

Objective 4

Economic Growth

Indicator	4--15 Growth in (real) gross domestic product (GDP) per capita
Definition	Missions are not expected to report on this indicator. The information is tracked by EGAT. Annual percentage growth rate of GDP per capita based on constant local currency. GDP per capita is gross domestic product divided by midyear population. GDP at purchaser's prices is the sum of gross value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any product taxes and minus any subsidies not included in the value of the products. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or for depletion and degradation of natural resources.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	A steady increase in this objective is necessary, though not sufficient, for sustainable broad-based economic growth that reduces poverty and provided domestic resources for sustainable investments in all other development objectives. The pattern of growth and the distribution of and access to the income, wealth and assets it produces are also important.
Indicator Type	Outcome/Impact
Unit of Measure	Annual percent change, calculated by dividing the most recent year's GDP per capita by that for the preceding year and subtracting one.
Use of Indicator	This is the most common indicator of economic growth. If GDP is growing faster than the population growth rate, average household incomes should be rising and the rate of poverty declining and the society should gradually have more resources to invest in vital social services and infrastructure. Annual report should be the percent of all USAID-assisted countries with GDP per capita growth >2.0%
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	World Bank World Development Indicators (WDI), most easily obtained annually from EADS/ESDB at: http://esdb.eads.usaidallnet.gov/query/do? program=/eads/esdb/source&source=WDI
Known Data Limitations	Does not include measures of household economic activities and can only use rough estimates of informal economic sector activities. Does not imply that all households or economic actors benefit from an increase or suffer from a decrease in the growth rate.
Baseline Timeframe	2009
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

4.1 Macroeconomic Foundation for Growth

Indicator	4.1-3 Inflation Rate, consumer prices, annual
Definition	Missions are not expected to report on this indicator. The information is tracked by EGAT. Inflation as measured by the consumer price index reflects the annual percentage change in the cost to the average consumer of acquiring a basket of goods and services that may be fixed or changed at specified intervals, such as yearly. The Laspeyres formula is generally used.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	If the rate of price inflation is too high private investment is skewed away from creating longer-term productive assets toward short-term retail and speculative activities. Reasonable price stability is important for sustainable economic growth in real terms.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent change
Use of Indicator	This is a basic indicator of macroeconomic stability achieved through wise use of both fiscal and monetary policies. It should be reported as the percent of all USAID-assisted countries with rates of domestic price inflation declining or = or < 5.0%. Persistent inflation greater than 5% per year is indicative of a situation out of control that must be addressed. Inflation is a distorting tax. The objective is to minimize it.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reported annually in World Bank World Development Indicators (WDI), most easily obtained annually from EADS/ESDB at: http://esdb.eads.usaidallnet.gov/query/do? program=/eads/esdb/source&source=WDI http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/FP.CPI.TOTL.ZG
Known Data Limitations	Inflation data is readily available in all countries, although measurement by the authorities can sometimes be imprecise. This can be periodically monitored.
Baseline Timeframe	Available for most countries for any desired baseline. Usually published monthly, quarterly and annually.
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	4.1-8 Government revenue (tax & non-tax), excluding foreign grants, as a percent of gross domestic product (GDP)
Definition	Missions are not expected to report on this indicator. The information is tracked by EGAT. Revenue is cash receipts from taxes, social contributions, and other revenues such as fines, fees, rent, and income from property or sales. Grants are also considered as revenue but are excluded here.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Enough government revenue must be collected to enable sufficient investment in health and education services and economic infrastructure for the economy to flourish, GDP per capita to rise and poverty to decline. This is an excellent indicator to use for measuring USAID tax and fiscal reform programmatic impact.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent of GDP
Use of Indicator	To determine if host-country governments are able to collect a minimum amount of domestic revenue necessary for public investments in key development activities leading to sustained economic growth, in addition to the finance of recurring expenditures. This is an excellent indicator to use for measuring USG tax and fiscal reform programmatic impact. It can be reported as the percent of all USG-assisted countries achieving an Increase in government revenue or in which revenue is already = or > 20 % of GDP. Countries that have difficulties raising revenues amounting to near 20% of GDP may have difficulty growing and developing without lots of external assistance.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	International Monetary Fund, Government Finance Statistics Yearbook and data files, and World Bank and OECD GDP estimates, reported annually in WB World Development Indicators (WDI), most easily obtained annually from EADS/ESDB at: http://esdb.eads.usaidallnet.gov/query/do?_program=/eads/esdb/source&source=WDI and http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/GC.REV.XGRT.GD.ZS
Known Data Limitations	This indicator does not measure whether the revenues are actually spent on priority development activities (like health, education and infrastructure), but unless a critical minimum can be collected those investments cannot be satisfactorily undertaken. This data is reported annually to the IMF, according to its guidelines, and is considered reliable.
Baseline Timeframe	2009
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	4.1-9 Cash surplus/deficit (percent of gross domestic product)
Definition	Missions are not expected to report on this indicator. The information is tracked by EGAT. Cash surplus or deficit is revenue (including grants) minus expense, minus net acquisition of nonfinancial assets.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The fiscal balance is the most reliable measure of the macroeconomic impact of fiscal policy. Financing a deficit that is too large drains resources away from private sector investment, and the excess of government expenditures over tax revenues is inflationary unless financed from private savings.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent of GDP
Use of Indicator	Because this is a basic measure of appropriate fiscal policies, it will be used to judge the ability of a country to manage its finances. Appropriate fiscal policies provide an enabling environment that helps the country grow and prosper. It can be reported as the percent of all USG-assisted countries with average fiscal deficits declining or below a targeted 3.0% of GDP.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reported annually http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/GC.BAL.CASH.GD.ZS
Known Data Limitations	One year or more lag for reliable data for some countries.
Baseline Timeframe	Annual
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

4.1.1 – Fiscal Policy

Indicator	4.1.1-12 Tax administration and compliance improved (percent increase in tax collections) as a result of USG assistance
Definition	Improved tax administration and compliance is indicated by the percentage change in tax collections over a specified period of time. A good tax system is validated by the generation of higher revenues than a poorly designed or administered tax system can generate. This is an indicator of the success of a program of tax reform that includes reducing a tax gap resulting from non-compliance, that is, the tax gap is a measure of the extent to which taxpayers do not file returns, or if returns are filed, underreported and underpaid, or the tax payment is delinquent. This is also true of sales taxes or value added taxes underpaid by retailers, either because it is not collected, or they chose to collect, but not forward the payments to the tax authorities. Tax revenue, of course, refers to compulsory transfers to the government for public purposes. Fines, penalties and contributions to, for example, social security, are not included. Refunds and corrections for filing errors that result in overpayments are negative revenues. Broadening the tax base, lowering tax rates (especially income taxes), and improved tax administration usually result in improved taxpayer compliance, and higher total revenues. Improved tax administration is most effective when it includes more complete audit and investigation coverage, better, modern customs enforcement and increased efficiency in tax submission and collection procedures.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Economic growth
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percentage change
Use of Indicator	Contributions to project outcome progress and reporting
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Mission PMP; annual
Known Data Limitations	
Baseline Timeframe	2011
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	4.1.1-13 Number of tax regulatory and administrative procedures eliminated or improved as the result of USG assistance
Definition	Tax regulations interpret tax law. Tax regulations provide rules on how to calculate income, how to report income to the tax authorities, how to pay taxes, etc. Taxable income is seldom calculated in accordance with standard accounting rules. Accordingly, calculating, reporting and paying taxes is often complex, and consists of a large number of sometimes complicated regulations. A good tax system should be simple, and easily understood. The tax system should be perceived as fair. Complicated tax systems are difficult to understand, and can easily be perceived as unfair. Complicated tax systems encourage corruption and cheating. Simplified, uncomplicated tax regimes promote legalization, that is, encourage the switch from informal enterprises to more productive, dynamic, formal sector enterprises where economic growth is created. Simple tax systems are perceived as more fair, helping to reduce administrative burdens and compliance costs. This makes small businesses more capable and more productive. A smaller number of regulatory and administrative procedures characterize simple, uncomplicated, and generally more productive tax systems.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Economic Growth
Indicator Type	Project output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Mission PMP and reporting
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Mission PMP; annual
Known Data Limitations	
Baseline Timeframe	2011
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.1.1-14 Person hours of training completed in fiscal policy and fiscal administration supported by USG assistance
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: $\text{Hours of USG supported training course} \times \text{Number of people completing that training course.}$ Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training. Fiscal policy is defined as encouraging and helping countries to apply sustainable and efficient fiscal policies, which consist of establishing revenue and expenditure structures and develop management techniques that allow a government to manage the economy through the expansion and contraction of government spending. All support for fiscal policy should be decentralized to the appropriate level of government, and seek to eliminate the potential for corruption.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number (of person hours)
Use of Indicator	Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Attendance records of implementing partners that conduct training. Data are reported to the mission on a quarterly/annual basis.
Known Data Limitations	Attendance records may be incomplete or inaccurate, especially in the case of determining whether a participant <i>completed</i> an entire course. The universe of countries providing this type of training can vary from year to year; thus, trends should not be interpreted from aggregate data.
Baseline Timeframe	The universe of countries contributing to this indicator varies from year to year based on mission goals and budget; thus, the baseline is established by each country when this type of training begins.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.1.1-15 Number of days of USG supported technical assistance in fiscal policy and fiscal administration provided to counterparts or stakeholders
Definition	The provision of goods or services to developing countries and other USAID recipients in direct support of a development objective-as opposed to the internal management of the foreign assistance program. Services could include the transfer of knowledge and/or expertise by way of staff, skills training, research work and financing to support quality of program implementation and impact, support administration, management, representation, publicity, policy development and capacity building. Technical assistance includes both human and institutional resources. Technical assistance does not include financial assistance. Fiscal policy is defined as encouraging and helping countries to apply sustainable and efficient fiscal policies, which consist of establishing revenue and expenditure structures and develop management techniques that allow a government to manage the economy through the expansion and contraction of government spending. All support for fiscal policy should be decentralized to the appropriate level of government, and seek to eliminate the potential for corruption.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Technical assistance supports institutional capacity building, a key goal for long term sustainability.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of days of technical assistance provided in each reporting period. Rounded up or down into whole numbers.
Use of Indicator	To convey the coverage and capacity building contribution of USG programs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reporting by implementing partners on an annual basis.
Known Data Limitations	Validity: This indicator addresses only one of the limitations, exposure to concepts and systems that offer solutions to development problems or institutional gaps, that prevent people from taking appropriate actions. Precision: Simply knowing the number of person days of technical assistance provided does not provide information about the quality and appropriateness of the technical advice provided.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of people trained resulting from a project.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

4.1.2 – Monetary Policy

Indicator	4.1.2-9 Real effective exchange rate is aligned with the nominal exchange rate (REER index as percent of nominal index) as a result of USG assistance
Definition	The nominal exchange rate is the price of a country's currency in terms of another country's exchange rate, that is, it is the domestic price of a designated foreign currency. The real exchange rate (RER) measures the value of a country's goods against the goods of some other country, a set of other countries, or even the rest of the world, that is, the RER indicates the approximate purchasing power of one country's currency in another. RER indexes can be constructed to indicate this relationship. Real effective exchange rates REERs measure currency alignments. REERs are calculated as an average of the bilateral RERs between a country and a basket of the currencies of its trading partners. The REER can be the result of differences in inflation, that is, a country's REER can be expected to rise if there is more domestic inflation than in the countries it trades with. Should changes over time in the REER and the nominal exchange rate be similar, there is alignment of the nominal exchange rate and the REER. This is why a trend appreciation of the real effective exchange rate does not encourage the growth of exports, but favors imports, that is, countries with higher appreciation of the REER relative to the nominal exchange rate are not internationally competitive. Alignment can be indicated as the % of the value of an index of the REER to an index the value of the nominal exchange rate. 100% is perfect alignment. Since the REER can be relatively volatile in the short run, using averages of the two indices over a period of time is desirable. One year is appropriate. Central Banks routinely calculate REERs.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Economic growth
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Mission PMP and reporting
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Mission PMP; annual
Known Data Limitations	
Baseline Timeframe	2011
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.1.2-10 Number of banking regulations changed to conform to modern international standards
Definition	Banking regulations are rules for the structure and conduct of banking and the financial system as a whole, designed to assure the system's soundness and integrity. Excessive or outdated regulations can result in market distortions and constrain economic growth. Simple rules that are easy to understand, communicate, enforce and verify are preferable to unduly complicated rules that are hard to understand, cannot be easily explained, cannot be effectively enforced, or cannot be verified. Banking regulations in developing countries should be modernized and harmonized with the international banking system to encourage integration with developed country financial institutions. Local and international financial institutions should all be subject to the same domestic regulations.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Economic growth
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Project progress on outcome; reporting
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Mission PMP; annual
Known Data Limitations	
Baseline Timeframe	2011
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.1.2-11 Person hours of training completed in monetary policy supported by USG assistance
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: Hours of USG supported training course x Number of people completing that training course. Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training. Monetary policy consists of various mechanisms, such as interest rates, to allow the government to manage the economy by expanding or contracting the money supply. Programs must encourage and help host countries to apply monetary policies that keep inflation low in the short- and long-term, establish the basis for financial stability, and are properly coordinated with fiscal policy to maintain internal and external balance.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number (of person hours)
Use of Indicator	Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Attendance records of implementing partners that conduct training. Data are reported to the mission on a quarterly/annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Attendance records may be incomplete or inaccurate, especially in the case of determining whether a participant <i>completed</i> an entire course. The universe of countries providing this type of training can vary from year to year; thus, trends should not be interpreted from aggregate data.
Baseline Timeframe	The universe of countries contributing to this indicator varies from year to year based on mission goals and budget; thus, the baseline is established by each country when this type of training begins.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.1.2-12 Number of days of USG supported technical assistance in monetary policy provided to counterparts or stakeholders
Definition	The provision of goods or services to developing countries and other USAID recipients in direct support of a development objective-as opposed to the internal management of the foreign assistance program. Services could include the transfer of knowledge and/or expertise by way of staff, skills training, research work and financing to support quality of program implementation and impact, support administration, management, representation, publicity, policy development and capacity building. Technical assistance includes both human and institutional resources. Technical assistance does not include financial assistance. Monetary policy consists of various mechanisms, such as interest rates, to allow the government to manage the economy by expanding or contracting the money supply. Programs must encourage and help host countries to apply monetary policies that keep inflation low in the short- and long-term, establish the basis for financial stability, and are properly coordinated with fiscal policy to maintain internal and external balance.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Technical assistance supports institutional capacity building, a key goal for long term sustainability.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of days of technical assistance provided in each reporting period. Rounded up or down into whole numbers.
Use of Indicator	To convey the coverage and capacity building contribution of USG programs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reporting by implementing partners on an annual basis.
Known Data Limitations	Validity: This indicator addresses only one of the limitations – exposure to concepts and systems that offer solutions to development problems or institutional gaps -- that prevent people from taking appropriate actions. Precision: Simply knowing the number of person days of technical assistance provided does not provide information about the quality and appropriateness of the technical advice provided.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of people trained resulting from a project.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

4.2 – Trade and Investment

Indicator	4.2-10 Foreign trade (X+M) as a percentage of GDP
Definition	Missions are not expected to report on this indicator. The information is tracked by EGAT. Sum of exports as % of GDP and imports as % of GDP. Exports of goods and services represent the value of all goods and other market services provided to the rest of the world. They include the value of merchandise, freight, insurance, transport, travel, royalties, license fees, and other services such as communication, construction, financial, information, business, personal, and government services. They exclude labor and property income (formerly called factor services), as well as transfer payments. Imports of goods and services represent the value of all goods and other market services received from the rest of the world. They include the value of merchandise, freight, insurance, transport, travel, royalties, license fees, and other services such as communication, construction, financial, information, business, personal, and government services. They exclude labor and property income (formerly called factor services), as well as transfer payments.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Rapid economic growth and development are associated with strong, open economies with exports and imports becoming a relatively high percentage of GDP. This will lead to poverty reduction and higher incomes and consumption.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent of GDP
Use of Indicator	It provides an indication of the overall success of efforts to improve the capacity of client countries to engage in international trade. It should be reported as the percent of all USG-assisted countries with X+M increasing or already = or > 80% of GDP.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	World Bank national accounts data and OECD National Accounts data files. Reported annually in World Bank, World Development Indicators (WDI), most easily obtained annually from EADS/ESDB at: http://esdb.eads.usaidallnet.gov/query/do?_program=/eads/esdb/source&source=WDI
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	2009, or as desired
Disaggregate(s)	Exports as % of GDP and Imports as % of GDP; Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	4.2-11 Gross capital formation as Percent of GDP
Definition	Missions are not expected to report on this indicator. The information is tracked by EGAT. Gross capital formation (formerly gross domestic investment) consists of outlays on additions to the fixed assets of the economy plus net changes in the level of inventories. Fixed assets include land improvements (fences, ditches, drains, and so on); plant, machinery, and equipment purchases; and the construction of roads, railways, and the like, including schools, offices, hospitals, private residential dwellings, and commercial and industrial buildings. Inventories are stocks of goods held by firms to meet temporary or unexpected fluctuations in production or sales, and "work in progress." According to the 1993 United Nations System of National Accounts, net acquisitions of valuables are also considered capital formation.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Increasing GDP growth and thereby reducing poverty requires higher levels of capital investment, commonly recorded in national income accounts as gross capital formation.
Indicator Type	Program Area Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percentage GDP
Use of Indicator	This is a measure of the success of efforts to improve the investment climate of a country. It should be reported as the percent of all USG-assisted countries in which Gross capital formation is increasing or is already at least = or > 20% of GDP.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	World Bank national accounts data, and OECD National Accounts data files. Reported annually in World Bank, World Development Indicators (WDI), most easily obtained annually from EADS/ESDB at: http://esdb.eads.usaidallnet.gov/query/do?_program=/eads/esdb/source&source=WDI
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	FY 2009, or as appropriate.
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

4.2.1 – Trade and Investment Enabling Environment

Indicator	4.2.1-16 Time to export/import (days)
Definition	Missions are not expected to report on this indicator. The information is tracked by EGAT. The time necessary to comply with all procedures required to export goods. If a procedure can be accelerated for an additional cost, the fastest legal procedure is chosen. Doing Business compiles procedural requirements for exporting a standardized cargo of goods by ocean transport. Documents associated with every official procedure are counted—from the contractual agreement between the 2 parties to the delivery of goods—along with the time and cost necessary for completion. For exporting goods, procedures range from packing the goods at the warehouse to their departure from the port of exit. The time and cost for ocean transport are not included. Payment is made by letter of credit, and the time, cost and documents required for the issuance or advising of a letter of credit are taken into account. The ranking on the ease of trading across borders is the simple average of the percentile rankings on its component indicators. Local freight forwarders, shipping lines, customs brokers, port officials and banks provide information on required documents and cost as well as the time to complete each procedure. To make the data comparable across economies, several assumptions about the business and the traded goods are used.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Economic growth
Indicator Type	Third party certified outcome
Unit of Measure	Days
Use of Indicator	Mission PMP
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	WB Doing Business Indicator; annual
Known Data Limitations	Need to sum WB separate indicators for time necessary to comply with procedures for exports and imports, and divide by 2.
Baseline Timeframe	2011
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.2.1-17 Number of documents required to export/import goods across borders decreased
Definition	Reduction in the number of documents required to trade goods across borders as imports or exports; change in the total number of documents required as per World Bank Doing Business Indicator, confirmed by the Mission. Reducing the number of different documents required in cross border trade is key to maximizing the improved efficiency that trade generates as a basis for faster economic growth and poverty reduction. Missions may use cost to export and cost to import numbers reported by the World Bank in the “Trading Across Borders” numbers of the annual Doing Business (DB) reports as the basis for calculating time reductions should it be determined that the changes in cost reflected in bank reports can be attributed to Mission activities in trade facilitation. Should World Bank numbers be determined to reflect the results of Mission activities, then sum the separate import and export cost savings reported by the bank for each of the two most recent years, subtract year 1 from year 0. In the event World Bank numbers are judged not representative of the results of Mission activities, Missions may custom design well specified activity specific measurement procedures for this indicator, standardized to be valid over a period of years, and for changes in representative businesses and products. World Bank methodology for developing standardized trading across borders indicators is explained in detail in the Bank’s DB Reports.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Economic Growth
Indicator Type	Third party certified outcome
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Mission PMP; reporting
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	World Bank; annual
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.2.1-18 Number of quantitative restrictions and quotas eliminated this year
Definition	A quantitative restriction or quota is a restriction on the level of imports or exports that limits the quantity of a good or service that can be traded across borders. The principle target of these restrictions is usually imports, but exports of critical commodities such as oil, mining, or food are also frequently restricted. Restrictions can be specified in standard units of weight, volume, or other quantitative aspect. Restrictions may be per unit of time, or number of times traded across borders.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Economic Growth
Indicator Type	Project output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Mission PMP; reporting
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Mission PMP; annual
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	2011
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.2.1-19 Person hours of training completed in trade and investment enabling environment supported by USG assistance
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: $\text{Hours of USG supported training course} \times \text{Number of people completing that training course}$ Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training. Trade and investment enabling environment is defined as the policies, laws, regulations, and administrative practices affecting international trade and investment and the public and private sector institutions that support sustained, locally driven improvements in the trade environment that benefit both men and women.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	None
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number (of person hours)
Use of Indicator	Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Attendance records of implementing partners that conduct training. Data are reported to the mission on a quarterly/annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Attendance records may be incomplete or inaccurate, especially in the case of determining whether a participant <i>completed</i> an entire course. The universe of countries providing this type of training can vary from year to year; thus, trends should not be interpreted from aggregate data.
Baseline Timeframe	The universe of countries contributing to this indicator varies from year to year based on mission goals and budget; thus, the baseline is established by each country when this type of training begins.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.2.1-20 Number of days of technical assistance trade and investment environment provided to counterparts or stakeholders
Definition	The provision of goods or services to developing countries and other USAID recipients in direct support of a development objective-as opposed to the internal management of the foreign assistance program. Services could include the transfer of knowledge and/or expertise by way of staff, skills training, research work and financing to support quality of program implementation and impact, support administration, management, representation, publicity, policy development and capacity building. Technical assistance includes both human and institutional resources. Technical assistance does not include financial assistance. Trade and investment enabling environment is defined as the policies, laws, regulations, and administrative practices affecting international trade and investment and the public and private sector institutions that support sustained, locally driven improvements in the trade environment that benefit both men and women.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Technical assistance supports institutional capacity building, a key goal for long term sustainability.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of days of technical assistance provided in each reporting period. Rounded up or down into whole numbers.
Use of Indicator	To convey the coverage and capacity building contribution of USG programs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reporting by implementing partners on an annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Validity: This indicator addresses only one of the limitations – exposure to concepts and systems that offer solutions to development problems or institutional gaps -- that prevent people from taking appropriate actions. Precision: Simply knowing the number of person days of technical assistance provided does not provide information about the quality and appropriateness of the technical advice provided.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of people trained resulting from a project.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

4.2.2 – Trade and Investment Capacity

Indicator	4.2.2-3 Number of firms receiving USG capacity building assistance to export
Definition	Number of firms that received training, technical assistance and/or information from USG supported trade promotion-related entities. Typically, activities include trade shows, buyer/seller match making programs, market analysis and information, trade finance assistance, and guidance on how to comply with foreign country customs regulations and procedures. One important component of assistance to help nations increase their level of exports is counseling and advice to host country firms on the steps, procedures, and benefits from trading internationally. Trade promotion efforts help to increase private sector capacity to trade and bolster assistance programs aiming to improve and reform of a country's trade enabling environment.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Economic growth
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Mission PMP; reporting
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Mission PMP
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	2011
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.2.2-9 Number of firms receiving USG assistance that have obtained certification with (an) international quality control institution(s) in meeting minimum product standards
Definition	An international quality control institution can be a domestic institution that certifies to international standards. The most common set of international standards is ISO 9,000. This quality standard was first introduced in 1987 by the International Organization for Standards (ISO). Many national quality control institutions have adopted ISO standards. ISO 9000 is used in over 100 countries as a quality assurance standard. These standards specify how management operations should be carried out to insure that domestic suppliers and exporters design, produce, and deliver products and services that meet predetermined standards. Proven adherence to these standards throughout a value chain assures export customers of the quality and performance an exporter may claim for the goods and services this exporter sells.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Economic growth
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Mission PMP; reporting
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Tracking for Mission PMP
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	2011
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.2.2-10 Person hours of training completed in trade and investment capacity building supported by USG assistance
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: $\text{Hours of USG supported training course} \times \text{Number of people completing that training course}$ Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training. Trade and investment capacity is defined as the collection of services, technologies, equipment, and techniques used to enhance private sector response to international trade and investment opportunities.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number (of person hours)
Use of Indicator	Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Attendance records of implementing partners that conduct training. Data are reported to the mission on a quarterly/annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Attendance records may be incomplete or inaccurate, especially in the case of determining whether a participant <i>completed</i> an entire course. The universe of countries providing this type of training can vary from year to year; thus, trends should not be interpreted from aggregate data.
Baseline Timeframe	The universe of countries contributing to this indicator varies from year to year based on mission goals and budget; thus, the baseline is established by each country when this type of training begins.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.2.2-11 Number of days of USG supported technical assistance in trade and investment capacity provided to counterparts or stakeholders
Definition	The provision of goods or services to developing countries and other USAID recipients in direct support of a development objective-as opposed to the internal management of the foreign assistance program. Services could include the transfer of knowledge and/or expertise by way of staff, skills training, research work and financing to support quality of program implementation and impact, support administration, management, representation, publicity, policy development and capacity building. Technical assistance includes both human and institutional resources. Technical assistance does not include financial assistance. Trade and investment capacity is defined as the collection of services, technologies, equipment, and techniques used to enhance private sector response to international trade and investment opportunities.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Technical assistance supports institutional capacity building, a key goal for long term sustainability.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of days of technical assistance provided in each reporting period. Rounded up or down into whole numbers.
Use of Indicator	To convey the coverage and capacity building contribution of USG programs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reporting by implementing partners on an annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Validity: This indicator addresses only one of the limitations – exposure to concepts and systems that offer solutions to development problems or institutional gaps -- that prevent people from taking appropriate actions. Precision: Simply knowing the number of person days of technical assistance provided does not provide information about the quality and appropriateness of the technical advice provided
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of people trained resulting from a project.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

4.3 – Financial Services

Indicator	4.3-1 Domestic credit to the private sector as a percent of GDP
Definition	Missions are not expected to report on this indicator. The information is tracked by EGAT. Domestic credit to private sector refers to financial resources provided to the private sector (other than to other financial intermediaries), such as through loans, purchases of non-equity securities, and trade credits and other accounts receivable, that establish a claim for repayment. For some countries these claims include credit to public enterprises.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Economic growth is driven by productivity improvement, and investment in productivity requires access to credit. This indicator is a good indicator of the extent of financial intermediation in a country and the availability of credit. More developed countries have higher ratios of loans to the private sector to Gross Domestic Product (GDP), reflecting a more efficient allocation of resources within the country and an increased ability of companies to leverage their own internal resources with external funding. Higher ratios reflect a pathway to broad-based, inclusive economic growth.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent of GDP
Use of Indicator	To track improved financial intermediation and more efficient resource allocation. It can be reported as the percent of all USG-assisted countries with credit to the private sector increasing or already = or > 60% of GDP
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	World Bank, World Development Indicators (WDI), most easily obtained annually from EADS/ESDB at: http://esdb.eads.usaidallnet.gov/query/do?program=/eads/esdb/source&source=WDI
Known Data Limitations	There may be lags in data availability for countries that do not have in place timely financial sector reporting systems. This is not widespread.
Baseline Timeframe	2009
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	4.3-3 Interest rate spread (percentage points)
Definition	Interest rate spread is the interest rate charged by banks on loans to prime customers minus the interest rate paid by commercial or similar banks for demand, time, or savings deposits. The net interest rate spread can be viewed as the difference between the average yield a financial institution receives from loans and other interest-accruing activities and the average rate it pays on deposits and borrowings. Read more: http://www.investopedia.com/terms/n/net-interest-rate-spread.asp#ixzz1WGa9rrZG
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator captures the quality of the financial sector enabling environment and sophistication of a country's financial sector infrastructure, as well as the level of competition present, i.e., the efficiency of financial intermediation and the perceived level of non-transaction specific (exogenous) risk. Higher spreads indicate a less favorable environment (raising the costs of doing business and the increased risks) and less competition.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percentage points
Use of Indicator	To track the development of efficient financial intermediation in the banking sector of the country. The net interest rate spread is a key determinant of a financial institution's profitability. Ideally, this spread should not generally exceed 6 percentage points for good customers. Spreads substantially above 6 percentage points indicate inefficiencies in the financial system, and the possibility that the financial system of the country could be a binding constraint to faster economic growth and development.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics and data files. Reported annually in World Bank, World Development Indicators (WDI), most easily obtained annually from EADS/ESDB at: http://esdb.eads.usaidallnet.gov/query/do?_program=/eads/esdb/source&source=WDI
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	2009
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

4.3.1 – Financial Sector Enabling Environment

Indicator	4.3.1-1 Has an automated off-site bank surveillance system been installed and made operational this year as the result of USG assistance?
Definition	An automated off-site surveillance system is an IT system that provides automated data capture, management and analysis of the financial data submitted periodically by regulated financial institutions within a secure environment. This indicator should be counted as “yes”, if USG assistance was provided and the system is operational. The capacity of regulatory supervision agencies is often constrained by competition for qualified staff from the private sector. Automating the off-site surveillance process enables the regulator to monitor the financial performance and condition of a wider range of financial institutions and target supervisory intervention based on risks identified from analysis of the data. This leverages examination resources and improves the consistency and accuracy of financial markets oversight.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Economic growth
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Affirmation (yes or no)
Use of Indicator	Mission PMP; reporting
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Mission PMP; report negative affirmations each annual occurrence; report positive affirmation once and stop.
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	2011
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.3.1-10 Number of on-site bank audits or execution of supervisory examinations as the result of USG assistance
Definition	The number of on-site audits or execution of supervisory examinations in which a USG implementing partner has contributed to the planning, evaluation and form of the resulting report, typically in a mentoring capacity. On the job Training of the on-site audit staff is most effective through learning through doing – typically the USG supported advisor cannot necessarily participate directly in an on-site audit, but can coach throughout the process. Qualitative data may be collected on the number of examinations that found significant weaknesses, the number of those that were resolved, and the number that were not resolved during the reporting period.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Economic Growth
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Mission PMP; reporting
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Mission PMP
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	2011
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.3.1-11 Person hours of training completed by financial sector supervisors supported by USG assistance
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: $\text{Hours of USG supported training course} \times \text{Number of people completing that training course}$ Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training. Financial sector enabling environment is defined as supporting the establishment of expert regulators and professional bodies that constantly improve laws, regulations, standards, and administrative practices that shape the sector.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number (of person hours)
Use of Indicator	Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Attendance records of implementing partners that conduct training. Data are reported to the mission on a quarterly/annual basis.
Known Data Limitations	Attendance records may be incomplete or inaccurate, especially in the case of determining whether a participant <i>completed</i> an entire course. The universe of countries providing this type of training can vary from year to year; thus, trends should not be interpreted from aggregate data.
Baseline Timeframe	The universe of countries contributing to this indicator varies from year to year based on mission goals and budget; thus, the baseline is established by each country when this type of training begins.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.3.1-12 Number of days of USG funded technical assistance in financial sector enabling environment provided to counterparts or stakeholders
Definition	The provision of goods or services to developing countries and other USAID recipients in direct support of a development objective-as opposed to the internal management of the foreign assistance program. Services could include the transfer of knowledge and/or expertise by way of staff, skills training, research work and financing to support quality of program implementation and impact, support administration, management, representation, publicity, policy development and capacity building. Technical assistance includes both human and institutional resources. Technical assistance does not include financial assistance. Financial sector enabling environment is defined as supporting the establishment of expert regulators and professional bodies that constantly improve laws, regulations, standards, and administrative practices that shape the sector.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Technical assistance supports institutional capacity building, a key goal for long term sustainability.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of days of technical assistance provided in each reporting period. Rounded up or down into whole numbers.
Use of Indicator	To convey the coverage and capacity building contribution of USG programs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reporting by implementing partners on an annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Validity: This indicator addresses only one of the limitations – exposure to concepts and systems that offer solutions to development problems or institutional gaps -- that prevent people from taking appropriate actions. Precision: Simply knowing the number of person days of technical assistance provided does not provide information about the quality and appropriateness of the technical advice provided.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of people trained resulting from a project.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

4.3.2 – Financial Services

Indicator	4.3.2-5 Bank nonperforming loans to total gross loans
Definition	Missions are not expected to report on this indicator. The information is tracked by EGAT. Bank nonperforming loans to total gross loans are the value of nonperforming loans divided by the total value of the loan portfolio (including nonperforming loans before the deduction of specific loan-loss provisions). The loan amount recorded as nonperforming should be the gross value of the loan as recorded on the balance sheet, not just the amount that is overdue. A non-performing loan is a loan that is in default or close to being in default. This is typically a three month period, but may vary according to actual contracts.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	While risk is an inherent aspect of lending, a healthy banking system has the capacity to intermediate effectively and to take corrective action in the event of a default. One measure of this is the level of non-performing loans. Effective financial intermediation between savers and investors is essential for sustained economic growth.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent
Use of Indicator	This indicator provides a measure of the financial health of the banking system, as well as the health of the financial sector enabling environment (in particular the capacity to enforce a loan contract in the event of a default). It should be reported as the percent of all USG-assisted countries with bank non-performing loans decreasing or already = or < 4.0% of total gross loans
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	International Monetary Fund, Global Financial Stability Report. Reported annually in World Bank, World Development Indicators (WDI), most easily obtained annually from EADS/ESDB at: http://esdb.eads.usaidallnet.gov/query/do? program=/eads/esdb/source&source=WDI
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	2009
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	4.3.2-6 Amount of private sector financing mobilized with DCA guarantees
Definition	The amount of financing in U.S. dollars from the private sector that is guaranteed by the Development Credit Authority guarantee and has been provided to a targeted borrower(s). This indicator measures the amount of private financing available for start-up and expansion of self-employment and micro and small enterprises. Without the DCA guarantee, micro enterprises, for example, would have less access to credit.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Economic Growth
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	U.S. dollar
Use of Indicator	Mission PMP; reporting
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Mission PMP
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	2011
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.3.2-7 Number of financial institutions receiving USG assistance in extending services to micro and small businesses
Definition	Number of formal sector banking institutions that USAID works with to develop techniques and mechanisms for providing banking services, including financing, to SMEs.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Economic Growth
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Mission PMP; reporting
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Mission PMP; annual
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	2011
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.3.2-8 Person hours of training completed by financial sector professionals on international standards supported by USG assistance
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: $\text{Hours of USG supported training course} \times \text{Number of people completing that training course}$ Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training. Financial sector capacity is defined as improving policies, laws, and regulations affecting the performance of the financial sector, providing for appropriately sequenced liberalization of financial markets that: expand the role of the private sector in providing services; enlarge the range, improve the quality, and enhance the equitable accessibility of financial services, especially to the poor; provide equitable access to women, men and other social groups; maintain the stability of the financial sector; and, optimize coordinated, unified, and effective supervision across all sub-sectors of the financial system.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number (of person hours)
Use of Indicator	Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Attendance records of implementing partners that conduct training. Data are reported to the mission on a quarterly/annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Attendance records may be incomplete or inaccurate, especially in the case of determining whether a participant <i>completed</i> an entire course. The universe of countries providing this type of training can vary from year to year; thus, trends should not be interpreted from aggregate data.

Baseline Timeframe	The universe of countries contributing to this indicator varies from year to year based on mission goals and budget; thus, the baseline is established by each country when this type of training begins.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.3.2-9 Number of days of USG funded technical assistance in financial sector capacity provided to counterparts or stakeholders
Definition	The provision of goods or services to developing countries and other USAID recipients in direct support of a development objective-as opposed to the internal management of the foreign assistance program. Services could include the transfer of knowledge and/or expertise by way of staff, skills training, research work and financing to support quality of program implementation and impact, support administration, management, representation, publicity, policy development and capacity building. Technical assistance includes both human and institutional resources. Technical assistance does not include financial assistance. Financial sector capacity is defined as improving policies, laws, and regulations affecting the performance of the financial sector, providing for appropriately sequenced liberalization of financial markets that: expand the role of the private sector in providing services; enlarge the range, improve the quality, and enhance the equitable accessibility of financial services, especially to the poor; provide equitable access to women, men and other social groups; maintain the stability of the financial sector; and, optimize coordinated, unified, and effective supervision across all sub-sectors of the financial system.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Technical assistance supports institutional capacity building, a key goal for long term sustainability.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of days of technical assistance provided in each reporting period. Rounded up or down into whole numbers.
Use of Indicator	To convey the coverage and capacity building contribution of USG programs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reporting by implementing partners on an annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Validity: This indicator addresses only one of the limitations, exposure to concepts and systems that offer solutions to development problems or institutional gaps, that prevent people from taking appropriate actions. Precision: Simply knowing the number of person days of technical assistance provided does not provide information about the quality and appropriateness of the technical advice provided.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of people trained resulting from a project.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

4.4 - Infrastructure and Engineering

Indicator	4.4-8 Number of beneficiaries receiving improved infrastructure services due to USG assistance
Definition	This is the number of people who benefit from improved infrastructure services due to USAID assistance. This means that people either use an infrastructure service (such as transport) or receive an infrastructure product (such as ICT, water, sanitation, or electricity).
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The number of beneficiaries of USAID assisted infrastructure indicates the increasing amount of infrastructure outputs (ICT, water, sanitation, or electricity) and services (transportation) available as a result of USAID programs. More electricity, water, sanitation, telecommunications and transport is generally viewed as enabling more rapid and sustained economic growth.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Persons
Use of Indicator	This indicator will enable the Agency to explain to external stakeholders how many persons globally benefit from infrastructure supported by USAID.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	This indicator must be counted by USAID Operating Unit contractors and grantees on an annual basis. Each contractor and grantee will need to be asked to identify the infrastructure that has been supported with USAID funding, and to estimate using reasonable methods the number of beneficiaries of this infrastructure. This indicator will be extrapolated from the average number of persons per household, which will vary by country.
Known Data Limitations	The main limitations of this indicator include estimating the number of beneficiaries of community infrastructure such as roads or public facilities (schools, health clinics, etc.). Will require more detailed guidance on methodology to ensure consistency across countries.
Baseline Timeframe	The number of beneficiaries will be estimated annually.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

4.4.1 - Modern Energy Services

Indicator	4.4.1-31 Number of beneficiaries with improved energy services due to USG assistance
Definition	This is the number of people who benefit from improved energy services due to USAID assistance. Illustrative examples of improved energy service include a new electricity connection, improved cook stove, or access to gas, increased number of hours of electricity service, and reduced outages and voltage fluctuations.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The number of beneficiaries of USAID- assisted energy services indicates increased availability of energy for more rapid and sustained economic growth and social development.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Persons
Use of Indicator	This indicator will enable the Agency to explain to external stakeholders how many persons globally benefit from energy infrastructure supported by USAID.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	This indicator must be counted by USAID Operating Unit contractors and grantees on an annual basis. Each contractor and grantee will need to be asked to identify the infrastructure that has been supported with USAID funding, and to estimate using reasonable methods the number of beneficiaries of this infrastructure. This indicator will be extrapolated from the average number of persons per household, which will vary by country.
Known Data Limitations	The main limitations of this indicator include estimating the number of beneficiaries of energy services for public facilities (schools, health clinics, etc.) will require more detailed guidance on methodology to ensure consistency across countries.
Baseline Timeframe	The number of beneficiaries will be estimated annually.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.4.1-32 Total public and private funds leveraged by USG for energy projects
Definition	Non-USG debt and equity capital, donor grants, financial contributions, and in-kind support which is attributable to USG efforts, for energy projects. Examples include direct investment in the project, grants for technical assistance, contributions to a USG-managed fund or GDA, and in-kind support by volunteer experts. Dollars leveraged must be attributable to USG efforts in that they would not have been leveraged without USG involvement.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Given limitations of funding available from USG sources, leveraging funds from other sources is critical to efforts to expand access to energy services.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	U.S. dollars
Use of Indicator	This indicator will be used to demonstrate the USG's ability to attract additional resources for critical energy projects and enhance cost-effectiveness by leveraging volunteer experts.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data will be collected by USAID program managers and contractors from partners contributing to the project.
Known Data Limitations	Remote possibility that contributing partners may provide inaccurate information.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established by individual activity
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.4.1-33 Number of policy reforms/laws/regulations/ administrative procedures drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation to enhance sector governance and/or facilitate private sector participation and competitive markets as a result of USG assistance
Definition	Number of reforms, regulations, and procedures drafted by USG implementers and discussed with local stakeholders.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	An improved enabling environment is essential for attracting investment and improving the sustainability of all energy services.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Numbers
Use of Indicator	Reporting and accountability by in-country program managers. It will also be used to explain to external stakeholders how the USG works to promote reform and influence developing country policies for enhancing sector governance.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	
Known Data Limitations	
Baseline Timeframe	
Disaggregate(s)	

Indicator	4.4.1-34 Person hours of training completed in technical energy fields supported by USG assistance
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: $\text{Hours of USG supported training course} \times \text{Number of people completing that training course}$ Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training. Modern energy services are defined as increasing the efficiency, reliability, diversity, and transparency of energy services and promote investment in the development, transport, processing, and utilization of indigenous energy sources and imported fuels.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number (of person hours)
Use of Indicator	Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Attendance records of implementing partners that conduct training. Data are reported to the mission on a quarterly/annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Attendance records may be incomplete or inaccurate, especially in the case of determining whether a participant <i>completed</i> an entire course. The universe of countries providing this type of training can vary from year to year; thus, trends should not be interpreted from aggregate data.
Baseline Timeframe	The universe of countries contributing to this indicator varies from year to year based on mission goals and budget; thus, the baseline is established by each country when this type of training begins.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.4.1-35 Number of days of USG funded technical assistance in technical energy fields provided to counterparts or stakeholders
Definition	The provision of goods or services to developing countries and other USAID recipients in direct support of a development objective-as opposed to the internal management of the foreign assistance program. Services could include the transfer of knowledge and/or expertise by way of staff, skills training, research work and financing to support quality of program implementation and impact, support administration, management, representation, publicity, policy development and capacity building. Technical assistance includes both human and institutional resources. Technical assistance does not include financial assistance. Modern energy services are defined as increasing the efficiency, reliability, diversity, and transparency of energy services and promote investment in the development, transport, processing, and utilization of indigenous energy sources and imported fuels.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Technical assistance supports institutional capacity building, a key goal for long term sustainability.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of days of technical assistance provided in each reporting period. Rounded up or down into whole numbers.
Use of Indicator	To convey the coverage and capacity building contribution of USG programs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reporting by implementing partners on an annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Validity: This indicator addresses only one of the limitations – exposure to concepts and systems that offer solutions to development problems or institutional gaps -- that prevent people from taking appropriate actions. Precision: Simply knowing the number of person days of technical assistance provided does not provide information about the quality and appropriateness of the technical advice provided.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of people trained resulting from a project.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

4.4.2 - Communication Services

Indicator	4.4.2-15 Total public and private U.S. dollars leveraged by USG for ICT infrastructure projects
Definition	New non-USG debt and equity capital, which is attributable to USG efforts, for ICT projects.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Given the shortages of capital available from USG sources, raising capital from other sources is critical to expand ICT infrastructure.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	U.S. dollars
Use of Indicator	Reporting and accountability by in-country program managers.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Analysis of data provided by host country partners to USAID contractors and recipients on an ongoing basis.
Known Data Limitations	Integrity: Data could be manipulated by partners, contractors, and recipients to show better performance than actually occurred. Precision: There may be in-precision about what should be included. Reliability: Data collection and analysis could change over time due to changes in USAID implementers.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established by individual activity
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.4.2-17 Number of beneficiaries receiving improved ICT services due to USG assistance
Definition	This is the number of people who benefit from improved ICT services due to USAID assistance.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The number of beneficiaries of USAID- assisted ICT services indicates increased availability of ICT services for more rapid and sustained economic growth and social development.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Persons
Use of Indicator	This indicator will enable the Agency to explain to external stakeholders how many persons globally benefit from ICT infrastructure supported by USAID.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	This indicator must be counted by USAID Operating Unit contractors and grantees on an annual basis. Each contractor and grantee will need to be asked to identify the infrastructure that has been supported with USAID funding, and to estimate using reasonable methods the number of beneficiaries of this infrastructure. This indicator will be extrapolated from the average number of persons per household, which will vary by country.
Known Data Limitations	The main limitations of this indicator include estimating the number of beneficiaries of ICT services for public facilities (schools, health clinics, etc) will require more detailed guidance on methodology to ensure consistency across
Definition	Persons receiving benefits from improved ICT services
Baseline Timeframe	The number of beneficiaries will be estimated annually.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.4.2-18 Person hours of training completed in communication services supported by USG assistance
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: $\text{Hours of USG supported training course} \times \text{Number of people completing that training course}$ Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training. Communications services are defined as strengthening and supporting communications networks.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number (of person hours)
Use of Indicator	Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Attendance records of implementing partners that conduct training. Data are reported to the mission on a quarterly/annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Attendance records may be incomplete or inaccurate, especially in the case of determining whether a participant <i>completed</i> an entire course. The universe of countries providing this type of training can vary from year to year; thus, trends should not be interpreted from aggregate data.
Baseline Timeframe	The universe of countries contributing to this indicator varies from year to year based on mission goals and budget; thus, the baseline is established by each country when this type of training begins.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.4.2-19 Number of days of USG funded technical assistance in communications services provided to counterparts or stakeholders
Definition	The provision of goods or services to developing countries and other USAID recipients in direct support of a development objective-as opposed to the internal management of the foreign assistance program. Services could include the transfer of knowledge and/or expertise by way of staff, skills training, research work and financing to support quality of program implementation and impact, support administration, management, representation, publicity, policy development and capacity building. Technical assistance includes both human and institutional resources. Technical assistance does not include financial assistance. Communications services are defined as strengthening and supporting communications networks.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Technical assistance supports institutional capacity building, a key goal for long term sustainability.
Indicator Type	output
Unit of Measure	Number of days of technical assistance provided in each reporting period. Rounded up or down into whole numbers.
Use of Indicator	To convey the coverage and capacity building contribution of USG programs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reporting by implementing partners on an annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Validity: This indicator addresses only one of the limitations, exposure to concepts and systems that offer solutions to development problems or institutional gaps that prevent people from taking appropriate actions. Precision: Simply knowing the number of person days of technical assistance provided does not provide information about the quality and appropriateness of the technical advice provided.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of people trained resulting from a project.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

4.4.3 - Transport Services

Indicator	4.4.3-7 Number of beneficiaries receiving improved transport services due to USG assistance
Definition	This is the number of people who benefit from improved transport services due to USAID assistance.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The number of beneficiaries of USAID- assisted transport services indicates increased access to transport for more rapid and sustained economic growth and social development.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Persons
Use of Indicator	This indicator will enable the Agency to explain to external stakeholders how many persons globally benefit from transport infrastructure supported by USAID.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	This indicator must be counted by USAID Operating Unit contractors and grantees on an annual basis. Each contractor and grantee will need to be asked to identify the infrastructure that has been supported with USAID funding, and to estimate using reasonable methods the number of beneficiaries of this infrastructure.
Known Data Limitations	The main limitations of this indicator include estimating the number of beneficiaries of communal transport services will require more detailed guidance on methodology to ensure consistency across countries.
Baseline Timeframe	The number of beneficiaries will be estimated annually.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.4.3-13 Kilometers of roads constructed or repaired with USG assistance
Definition	This is the length of road that is constructed or repaired with USG assistance.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Length of road constructed or rehabilitated indicates increased access to improved transport for more rapid and sustained economic growth and social development.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Kilometer
Use of Indicator	This indicator will enable the Agency to explain to external stakeholders the amount of road that is rehabilitated or constructed by USAID.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	This indicator must be counted by USAID Operating Unit contractors and grantees on an annual basis. Each contractor and grantee will need to be asked to identify the length of road infrastructure that has been supported with USAID funding.
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	Annual reporting
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.4.3-14 Person hours of training completed in transportation technical fields supported by USG assistance
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: $\text{Hours of USG supported training course} \times \text{Number of people completing that training course.}$ Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training. Transport services are defined as supporting and strengthening reliable and affordable transportations systems.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number (of person hours)
Use of Indicator	Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Attendance records of implementing partners that conduct training. Data are reported to the mission on a quarterly/annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Attendance records may be incomplete or inaccurate, especially in the case of determining whether a participant <i>completed</i> an entire course. The universe of countries providing this type of training can vary from year to year; thus, trends should not be interpreted from aggregate data.
Baseline Timeframe	The universe of countries contributing to this indicator varies from year to year based on mission goals and budget; thus, the baseline is established by each country when this type of training begins.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.4.3-15 Number of days of USG funded technical assistance in transportation technical fields provided to counterparts or stakeholders
Definition	The provision of goods or services to developing countries and other USAID recipients in direct support of a development objective-as opposed to the internal management of the foreign assistance program. Services could include the transfer of knowledge and/or expertise by way of staff, skills training, research work and financing to support quality of program implementation and impact, support administration, management, representation, publicity, policy development and capacity building. Technical assistance includes both human and institutional resources. Technical assistance does not include financial assistance. Transport services are defined as supporting and strengthening reliable and affordable transportations systems.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Technical assistance supports institutional capacity building, a key goal for long term sustainability.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of days of technical assistance provided in each reporting period. Rounded up or down into whole numbers.
Use of Indicator	To convey the coverage and capacity building contribution of USG programs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reporting by implementing partners on an annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Validity: This indicator addresses only one of the limitations, exposure to concepts and systems that offer solutions to development problems or institutional gaps that prevent people from taking appropriate actions. Precision: Simply knowing the number of person days of technical assistance provided does not provide information about the quality and appropriateness of the technical advice provided.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of people trained resulting from a project.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

4.5 – Agriculture

Indicator	4.5-2 Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation
Definition	Jobs are all types of employment opportunities created during the reporting year in agriculture-related enterprises (including paid on-farm/fishery employment). Jobs lasting less than one month are not counted in order to emphasize those jobs that provide more stability through length. Jobs should be converted to full-time equivalents. Thus a job that lasts 4 months should be counted as 1/3 FTE. Number of hours worked per day or per week is not established as work hours may vary greatly. “Attributed to FTF implementation” includes farming and non-farm jobs where FTF investments were intentional in assisting in any way to expand (or contract) jobs and where a program objective of the FTF investment was job creation.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This is a direct measure of improved livelihoods, as it measures creation of employment and related income. However, FTF is concerned about creation of sustainable employment, not temporary employment (of short duration such as a period of less than one month).
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	FTEs
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners will collect this data directly from partner organizations receiving funds in programs linked to job generation. Data will be collected through a questionnaire. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• Data for this indicator will represent a good portion of job generated through USAID programs designed to create employment opportunities. This indicator will not represent all jobs created through FTF funding, only those traceable through implementing partners. • The definition for this indicator clearly specifies the parameters for collection of this data. BFS M&E staff will work with OUs to ensure an appropriate instrument is used for data collection. • Data for this indicator provides a gauge by which to measure the degree to which programs designed to generate jobs are proving effective. Data is a direct measure of a program outcome. • BFS M&E staff will work with Missions to ensure the data collection instrument and its application remains consistent for annual collection. • Data is collected annually and can be used in annual portfolio reviews and to influence management decision -making.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	Sex of jobholder (<i>if one FTE is split by a male and a female, then it would be 0.5 FTE for females and 0.5 FTE for males</i>) Urban/rural (location of job)

	New= this is the first time the person holds a job created by FTF Continuing = person continues to hold FTF created job from previous FY
--	---

Indicator	4.5-3 Percent Change in agricultural gross domestic product
Definition	The gross domestic product (GDP) or value of all final goods produced by the agricultural sector within a nation in a given year. The definition of agricultural GDP follows the approach used by the UN statistical office in assisting countries to improve their national accounts. Crop output “is the product of output and the unit price at basic prices” ...”less losses and wastes” ...plus the net change in inventories. In general “most countries assign output and its associated costs to the time when the crop is harvested.” Report year on year change in percent (i.e. annual growth rate)
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Agricultural GDP is a key measure of overall agricultural performance.
Indicator Type	Impact
Unit of Measure	Percent
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: The centrally-funded FTF M&E contractor should obtain this data from national accounts collected by the government Reporting Frequency: Annually reported
Known Data Limitations	• This indicator measures to our long-term impact of sustainably generating sustainable agriculture sector growth. • Data for this indicator will derive from statistics generated by the host governments. Data can be manipulated by host governments; however, USAID is working with other donors and partners to build up agriculture statistic capacity of host governments and much attention will be paid to improving data quality. • This indicator is primarily contextual to help USAID understand how our programs are impacting the national economic environment. • USAID missions are working with host governments to ensure quality and consistent processes for collection and analyses. • Data reporting varies between countries. We are working with host governments to report on an annual basis; however, limitations remain, making timeliness a challenge.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline established
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	4.5-4 Gross margin per unit of land, kilogram, or animal of selected product (crops/animals/fisheries selected varies by country)
Definition	The gross margin is the difference between the total value of sales of the agricultural product (crop, livestock, fish) and the cost of producing that item, divided by the total number of units (hectares of crops, kilograms of fish, number of animals for livestock) in production. Gross margin per hectare, or per animal, or per kilogram of fish for targeted commodities, is a measure of net income for that farm/fishery/livestock-use activity. Input costs included should be those significant input costs that can be easily ascertained. These are likely to be the cash costs. Most likely items are: purchased water, fuel, electricity, seed, feed or fish meal, fertilizer, pesticides, hired labor, hired enforcement, and hired machine/veterinary services. Reporting of current-year results for individuals and firms who have benefited in previous years from this same USG assistance should be included along with current-year results of current beneficiaries. Reporting all data elements (Area, Production, Quantity of Sales, Value of Sales, and Purchased Input Cost) requested is critical to the ability to aggregate results across missions. In addition, a sixth data element – water consumption in cubic meters – can be obtained in order to calculate water productivity (see measurement notes). Non-U.S. Dollars (USD) must be converted to USD for reporting purposes at the time the project is completed, or (for an ongoing project) when reporting results. Missions should use purchasing power parity (PPP) for the current year to complete the currency conversion.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Improving the gross margin of value chains for farming commodities or animals contributes to increasing agricultural GDP, will increase income, and thus directly contribute to the IR of improving production and the goal indicator of reducing poverty. Also assessing the gross margin of fisheries – through assessing biomass of fish caught - is an appropriate measure of the productivity of a fishery and the impacts of fisheries management interventions.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Dollars/hectare (crops); dollars/animal (livestock); or kilograms of fish (fishery);
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners should obtain this data annually (required). Data will be collected through standardized approaches wherein implementing partners/extension workers collect data quarterly through producer organization meetings using standardized group

	questionnaire. Note: If the item is home consumed then the market price received by farmers selling the product is used to value it. Cost includes all purchased inputs, purchased transportation (including fuel), or hired labor, but does not include any imputed value of family or community labor.
Known Data Limitations	Implementing Partners will need to be trained on methodology and data collection to ensure integrity. Partners may also seek to inflate numbers throughout the data collection process. To mitigate this, we will oversee the development of their data collection instruments to ensure quality and accuracy of collection. USAID will work to develop a precise timeline with each partner to ensure collection is well thought through and submitted in a timely manner.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	• Animal Commodity • Crop Commodity • Fish Commodity

Indicator	4.5-9 Per capita expenditures (as a proxy for income) of USG targeted beneficiaries
Definition	This indicator will measure the expenditures of rural households as a proxy for income, based on the assumption that increased expenditures is strongly correlated to increased income. The data will be sampled and collected in the same areas at the same time for baseline, midterm, and final. This indicator is a proxy instead of measuring income directly because of the difficulty in accurately measuring income. For example, people are often hesitant to provide true income levels to survey interviewers, plus remembering income over a year is difficult, especially if some forms of income might be taxed or require reporting to government officials (for example remittances). Expenditures can be obtained in shorter periods of time, or if there is someone in the household who is literate, through data sheets left at the house. This includes expenditures on food stuffs and estimated value of household consumption of items they grew. FTF will collect expenditure data in order to proxy the change (+/-) in income levels of targeted beneficiaries. Data for this indicator should be collected either through a Living Standards Measurement Survey Consumption Expenditure module or an adapted Poverty Assessment Tools. BFS is supporting the development of adapted PATs, developed through EGAT/PR, based on the consumption expenditure methodology of the Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS).
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	There is a relationship between increased incomes and improved food security, reduced poverty, and improved nutrition. The usefulness of an income proxy methodology derives from the importance of a change in household income and its impact on the overarching FTF goal of reducing poverty and hunger. Thus, measurement of household income (through this proxy) is one logical choice for monitoring the effects of policies and programs oriented towards accomplishing this goal.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	U.S. dollar <i>Note: To get USD, convert from local currency at the average exchange rate for the reporting period</i>
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Population-based surveys conducted by the M&E contractor in the FTF zone of influence (targeted population/sub-national level) • Baselines and finals will be collected in a population-based survey conducted by the centrally-funded M&E contractor. Mid-term data may be collected, depending on budget levels. ** <i>**Some mid-term data will be collected, but may be limited by budget availability – either by limiting the number of countries in which mid-term surveys are done, or by using a different survey method, such as LQAS, or by limiting the sample size</i>

Known Data Limitations	• Data collected for indicator represents well the intended result • The Bureau for Food Security (BFS) has developed consumption expenditure modules for collecting poverty data for all missions, standard collection, and methodology. • Data for this indicator is precise for measuring impacts, but only partly attributable to USAID programs. Can only provide context for tracking performance, which is useful for management decision-making purposes. • The Living Standards Methods Survey of collection and poverty data has been vigorously tested for reliability over the past several years.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline will begin 2010.
Disaggregate(s)	Percent of targeted beneficiaries who live in: Female no Male households (FNM), Male no Female households (MNF), male and female households (M&F)

Indicator	4.5-10 Total increase in installed storage capacity (m³)
Definition	This indicator measures total increase in functioning (refurbished and new) cubic meters of storage capacity that have been installed through USG programming and leverage. Installed storage capacity is an aggregate amount that encompasses on-farm and off-farm storage, dry goods and cold chain storage. Both newly installed and refurbished storage should be counted here.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The overall goal of the Feed the Future Initiative is to “Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger”. Post-harvest losses of foodstuffs and other agricultural products are typically a significant proportion of overall initial production in developing countries. A reduction in post-harvest losses through greater storage capacity could therefore substantially increase both food and income available to rural households and increase food availability to urban areas as well.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Total cubic meters
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners will collect data quarterly through interaction with partners receiving assistance to increase storage capacity. Reporting Frequency: Annual reporting of indicator from mission to Washington, D.C.
Known Data Limitations	Partners may also seek to inflate numbers throughout the data collection process. To mitigate this, we will oversee the development of their data collection instruments to ensure quality and accuracy of collection. USAID will work to develop a precise timeline with each partner to ensure collection is well thought through and submitted in a timely manner.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	Storage type: Dry storage/ Cold storage

Indicator	4.5-11 Market discount of targeted agriculture commodities
Definition	Numerator: Average price (including cost of cargo, insurance and freight, free on board or parallel point in a value chain) of selected commodity/product (US\$/metric ton) in country Denominator: Price (including cost of CIF/FOB/etc.) of that commodity/product in the relevant competing market or against an average price across the regional market. This market discount can be tracked longitudinally against an initial baseline of the reference market as well as laterally against current reference prices of the benchmark market. To illustrate: The price of maize in an FTF target country may be 60 percent of the price in a key reference regional market or as an average price across a region. The market discount is therefore 40% of the benchmark reference price. For example, the price of shelled groundnuts in Mozambique was \$511/metric ton in 2008, whereas the price of shelled Ethiopian groundnuts was \$1011/metric ton. Mozambique's shelled groundnuts traded at 50.5% of Ethiopia's, or at a market discount of 49.5%. Similarly, Mozambique's shelled groundnuts traded at 46% of the world price, a market discount of 66%. (Example derived from FAOSTAT data.)
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The overall goal of the Feed the Future Initiative is to "Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger". The market discount is a qualitative indicator that captures the value of products produced within a value chain and compares that value to an independent reference price. As value chains receive assistance (e.g., better maize drying practices used by farmers) the value of products should improve relative to the value of similar products benchmarked against a reference location(s). The market discount can be decomposed, if warranted, to determine where value is gained or lost relative to its external reference.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent: Volume (in tons) traded (assuming the commodity is clearly and narrowly defined)
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners will provide average price for targeted commodities for host national and the appropriate reference market price of competing market. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	For outcome indicators, Implementing Partners will need to be trained on methodology and data collection to ensure integrity. Partners may also seek to inflate numbers throughout the data collection process. To mitigate this, we will oversee the development of their data collection instruments to ensure quality and accuracy of collection. USAID

	will work to develop a precise timeline with each partner to ensure collection is well thought through and submitted in a timely manner.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	By Commodity Type: • Horticulture • Animal Products • Cereals • Oilseed • Dry Grain Pulses & Legumes • Roots, Tubers, & Other Staples • Other

Indicator	4.5-12 Percentage of national budget invested in agriculture
Definition	The percentage of a country's national budget allocated to agriculture is most likely reflected in the amount of money devoted to the Ministry of Agriculture.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Feed the Future places a strong emphasis on host government's commitment to building the agricultural sector and using resources to build-up country capacity. Part of our results framework includes increasing public sector investment as a pathway to inclusive agriculture sector growth. This indicator allows OUs to track the portion of national budget the host government has put into agriculture, illustrating the government's commitment to promoting agricultural sector improvements.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent The percentage is created based on the following: • Percentage of national budget invested in agriculture • Total national budget amount in U.S. dollar
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners of programs focused on policy change will collect data from host government budget data. Exact figures on investments in agriculture may or may not be publically available. When not publically available, implementing partners will work with appropriate ministries to get budget information. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• Data clearly demonstrates the intended result of increased public investment in agriculture. • There is a risk that publically available data could be manipulated for political reasons, thus implementing partners should attempt to gather accurate budget data and possibly cross reference from distinct offices. • Data for this indicator are contextual and help us to understand the host country environment. They should not be used to measure performance of implementing partners or the mission. Rather, they are a reference to understanding host country performance. • Data for this indicator should consistently be checked against national budget data. • Data for this indicator are available annually, which allows us to track the country context in annual portfolio reviews.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator / Denominator

Indicator	4.5-13 Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of people living on less than \$1.25/day
Definition	This indicator measures Millennium Development Goal Target 1a. (<i>The MDGs define this level as those living in “extreme poverty”. Although we do not use the word “extreme” in this title, we are referring to the same measure used by the UN for the MDGs.</i>) Halving extreme poverty refers to the period 1990 to 2015. The applicable poverty line has been updated to \$1.25 dollars per person per day, converted into local currency at 2005”Purchasing Power Parity” (PPP) exchange rates. The use of PPP exchange rates ensures that the poverty line applied in each country has the same real value. Measurement is based on the value of average daily consumption expenditure per person, where food and other items that a household consumes out of its own production are counted as if the household purchased those items at market prices. For example, all members of a household of four people are counted as poor if its average daily consumption expenditures are less than \$5 per day at 2005 PPP after adjusting for local inflation since 2005. The poverty rate is estimated by dividing the measured number of poor people in a sample of households by the total population of the households in the sample. FTF will collect expenditure data in order to calculate prevalence of poverty for this indicator, as well as for per capita income (for indicator 4.5-1). FTF will be using an adapted Poverty Assessment Tool (PAT), being developed through EGAT/PR, based on the consumption expenditure methodology of the Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS). Data for this indicator should be collected either through this adapted PAT or through the LSMS Consumption Expenditure module.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This measures the first goal of the Feed the Future Initiative as well as a Millennium Development Goal. It is the purpose of the program. All objectives, program elements and projects are designed to reduce poverty.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent Please enter these two data points: • Percentage of people from sample living on <\$1.25/day • Total population of people in zone of influence/targeted region
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The UN already collects this data for the MDGs at the country and regional level and a centrally-funded M&E contractor will collect at the program/sub-national level for targeted areas. USAID Missions do not need to collect this data separately. • Biennial: Baselines and finals will be collected in a population-based

	survey conducted by the centrally-funded M&E contractor. Mid-term data may be collected, depending on budget levels. ** <i>**Some mid-term data will be collected, but may be limited by budget availability – either by limiting the number of countries in which mid-term surveys are done, or by using a different survey method, such as LQAS, or by limiting the sample size</i>
Known Data Limitations	• Data collected for indicator represents well the intended result • The Bureau for Food Security (BFS) has developed consumption expenditure modules for collecting poverty data for all missions, standard collection, and methodology. • Data for this indicator is precise for measuring impacts, but only partly attributable to USAID programs. Can only provide context for tracking performance, which is useful for management decision-making purposes. • The Living Standards Methods Survey of collection and poverty data have been vigorously tested for reliability over the past several years.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	Percent of people who live on under \$1.25/day living in: Female no Male households (FNM), Male no Female households (MNF), male and female households (M&F); Numerator / Denominator

Indicator	4.5-14 Ease of Doing Business rank
Definition	Every year the World Bank publishes “Doing Business” with data gathered from almost all countries. The categories include: starting a business, construction permits, employing works, registering property, getting credit, protecting investors, paying taxes, trading across borders, enforcing contracts and closing a business. Most of the indicators that are used are easily understood like the number of procedures to start a business, the number of days to register property or total taxes as a percent of profit. In addition the Bank periodically publishes more detailed indices for individual countries which provide detail on the difference in different parts of the country. For the purpose of this indicator the overall score is used. The reporting country ought to look at the more detailed results to determine which items contributed to the improvement or lack of improvement of the overall score. This can provide a guide to actions that are most likely to improve the business environment From the WB website: <i>“The ease of doing business index ranks economies from 1 to 183. For each economy the index is calculated as the ranking on the simple average of its percentile rankings on each of the 9 topics included in the index in Doing Business 2011: starting a business, dealing with construction permits, registering property, getting credit, protecting investors, paying taxes, trading across borders, enforcing contracts and closing a business. The ranking on each topic is the simple average of the percentile rankings on its component indicators. If an economy has no laws or regulations covering a specific area—for example, bankruptcy—it receives a “no practice” mark. Similarly, an economy receives a “no practice” or “not possible” mark if regulation exists but is never used in practice or if a competing regulation prohibits such practice. Either way, a “no practice” mark puts the economy at the bottom of the ranking on the relevant indicator.”</i>
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Improving the business environment is likely to contribute to improving investment. The World Bank emphasizes that most of the data collected for the DB comes from small and medium businesses which makes it more useful for FTF. The Bank also provides detailed information on how the data is collected as well as where there are weaknesses. The development hypothesis is that making it easier to do business is likely to lead to more investments in the agriculture sector, and thus jobs. The increase in investment throughout the value chain will improve agricultural productivity (the IR) which in turn will contribute to agricultural sector growth (the Key Objective). As most of the poor are involved directly or indirectly in agriculture this improvement will reduce poverty.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number Rank
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source	DATA SOURCE:

and Reporting Frequency	World Bank <i>Doing Business</i>, an annual report available on line: http://www.doingbusiness.org/ Please see the data collection methodology here http://www.doingbusiness.org/methodology/methodology-note#Ease of DB Note that the Gates Foundation and the World Bank are looking into developing an “Ease of doing Agri-business” indicator, but it is not yet available. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• Data for this indicator clearly shows improvements in the enabling environment which is the intended results. • Data for this indicator is collected, analyzed, and reported by a team of economic experts of the World Bank, which is a highly reputable organization whose indicators are used by experts in varying sector throughout the world. They are the pre-eminent authority on tracking country economic progress. • This is a contextual indicator that helps us understand how our investments in policy are affecting the macro-economic conditions and a given country. It sets the context for accurate decision-making. • Data collection methods and analysis are very standardized and transparent. Limited changes would occur over time and reflect new understandings of current contexts as would be expected. Annual collection of this indicator is sufficient to inform management decision making.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	Each of the 9 components (Starting a Business, Dealing with Construction Permits, Registering Property, getting Credit, Protecting Investors, Paying taxes, Trading across borders, Enforcing Contracts, Closing a Business); rank will be reported; Nominator/denominator (percent)

4.5.1 – Agriculture Enabling Environment

Indicator	4.5.1-17 Kilometers of roads improved or constructed
Definition	A road opens up transport from rural spaces where rural-based production activities such as agriculture are taking place, and connects, either directly or indirectly, with population centers and market activity. A road “improvement” indicates that the intervention improved the ease of commercial transport along that road, while “constructed” refers to a new road. Include the extent to which roads are built/improved to be climate resistant. In general, a road need not necessarily be paved with cement or asphalt but should significantly facilitate the transport of goods compared to the previous situation without the road or without the road improvement. Please only count those road improved or constructed during the reporting year.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The linkage of rural communities to markets is considered a crucial means of increasing agricultural and other rural-based production as well as the access of rural communities to food at reasonable prices as well as greater off-farm employment opportunities and access to health and nutrition services.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Kilometers
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	DATA SOURCE: Implementing partners should record how many kilometers of road they have constructed or improved. REPORTING FREQUENCY: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• These data very clearly represent intended results of improving and building roads. • Data for this indicator should come from implementing partner records and OUs can easily verify this indicator. • Data are very precise for demonstrating if a program is achieving its targets. • Collection processes should not change over time. It is the recording of a simple concept.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	• Improved • Constructed

Indicator	4.5.1-21 Number of climate vulnerability assessments conducted as a result of USG assistance
Definition	Where existing vulnerability assessments carried out under national or donor processes are not sufficient for developing and implementing a program, a climate (in meteorological terms) vulnerability assessment should be conducted using best practices, at a relevant temporal and spatial scale for the envisioned program, and involving key stakeholders. Best practices include the participatory identification of priority climate-sensitive sectors, livelihoods or systems; identification of priority populations and regions; assessment of anticipated climate and non-climate stresses; estimates of potential impacts; and assessment of exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity of the system to climate stresses. Only count those assessments conducted during the reporting year.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Vulnerability assessments that take climate and non-climate stressors into account form the basis for programming by presenting an integrated problem analysis. A vulnerability assessment should inform, and will help to justify, a program by indicating why certain strategies or activities are necessary to minimize exposure to climate stress, reduce sensitivity, or strengthen adaptive capacity. A range of methods may be used, depending on the decision context, including participatory workshops, community-based PRA-type assessments, economic assessments, risk and vulnerability mapping, etc.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of assessments
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) and missions to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners should record this information in program documents. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• Data clearly represent the intended result of encouraging national and local organizations using information on climate (meteorological elements) vulnerability assessment. • Data are collected through implementing partners' interaction with participants and reported through program documents. • Data precisely reflects the outputs of implementing partners who are encouraging participants in climate change analysis. • Data collection processes are simple and straightforward; they should not change over time. • The rate of change for this indicator is adequate for quick reporting and to be integrated into decision-making processes.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.5.1-22 Number of rural hectares mapped and adjudicated
Definition	This indicator should be used as an outcome indicator to measure a step in the process towards formalization (see indicator #4.5.1-16), and it tracks the number of additional rural hectares that are mapped and adjudicated. “Mapped” indicates that the borders of a land area or water body are clearly indicated as to their physical/geographical location. “Adjudicated” indicates that clear property ownership rights have been established and/or use rights have been defined. This can indicate one owner with “full” use rights to dispose as s/he deems fit including the sale of the land to another owner, or this could be some type of public or common property rights adjudication. This latter situation could involve deciding, for example where certain individuals, certain communities, the public, etc. may or may not engage in certain “use” activities such as to hunt and/or fish and/or engage in agriculture or grazing but does not involve individual ownership. This indicator counts how many additional hectares were mapped and adjudicated in a given year within the project/program area. This contrasts to the other property rights indicator “number of hectares formalized,” (#4.5.1-16) which counts the total amount of land that has been assigned formal ownership within the project program area. Catch shares and fishing access rights are included here. Note: Use only the hectares mapped and adjudicated during the reporting year.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Clear property rights are a prerequisite for secure investment that encourages long term economic growth in rural areas. Clear property rights also contribute to sustainable use over time by defining what activities may or may not take place on a given area of land and who can engage in those activities.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Hectares
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners will collect data from secondary records held by the national government/National Cadastral Service. REPORTING FREQUENCY: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• Data represent an intermediate result of greater areas of land mapped and adjudicated, a step in the process towards formalized land rights. • Because the source is the National Cadastral Service/host government, data are unlikely to be manipulated. Furthermore, because implementing partners are pulling from secondary sources, they are unlikely to inflate the numbers • Data represent a step in the process towards formalized land rights; however, managers should keep in mind that implementing partners may have little control over the governmental institutions and policies

	that can make affect results. • Data collection process is from secondary sources and should remain consistent. • Rate of change for this indicator should be appropriate for annual reporting.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	Sex of landowner(s) with the formalized rights: male, female, or joint (if firm-owned, use sex of proprietorship) or “firm-owned” if proprietorship is unknown or inappropriate to disaggregate

Indicator	4.5.1-24 Number of Policies, Regulations, and Administrative Procedures in development, passed, or being implemented as a result of USG assistance
Definition	These are 5 different indicators, each measuring a successive stage in the progression from analysis to implementation Number of agricultural enabling environment policies/ regulations/ administrative procedures in the areas of agricultural resource, food, market standards and regulation, public investment, natural resource or water management and climate change adaptation/mitigation as it relates to agriculture that: Stage 1: ...underwent the first stage of the policy reform process i.e. analysis (review of existing policy/ regulation/ administrative procedure and/or proposal of new policy/ regulations/ administrative procedures). Stage 2: ...underwent the second stage of the policy reform process. The second stage includes public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised policy/ regulation/ administrative procedure. Stage 3: ... underwent the third stage of the policy reform process (policies were presented for legislation/decreed to improve the policy environment for smallholder-based agriculture.) Stage 4: ...underwent the fourth stage of the policy reform process (official approval (legislation/decreed) of new or revised policy / regulation/ administrative procedure by relevant authority). Stage 5: ...completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy/ regulation/ administrative procedure by relevant authority). Please count the highest stage completed during the reporting year.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The indicator measures the number of policies/ regulations/ administrative procedures in the various stages of progress towards an enhanced enabling environment for agriculture whose sub-elements are specific policy sectors. This indicator is easily aggregated upward from all operating units.
Indicator Type	Stages 1 & 2 = Output Stages 3, 4, & 5 = Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners, whose programs target policy reform, will report on this indicator based on their engagement with the national government in policy reform. REPORTING FREQUENCY: Annual
Known Data Limitations	Data for this this indicator clearly represent the intended results of supporting policy reform.

	• Missions should closely assess reported values against indicator definitions of the five stages and periodically review data collection process to ensure accurate reporting. • Data are useful to track performance of implementing partners working on policy reform; however, the outcomes for this indicator are greatly dependent on host country will and processes. Decision-makers should look at country context when using data for performance decisions. • The definition for this indicator has been clearly operationalized, enabling implementing partners and missions to easily determine between stages. These definitions will remain consistent over collection periods. • Process for data collection is simple and not time consuming. Annual reporting allows missions and bureaus to use data for annual portfolio reviews.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	Stage 1: Analyzed Stage 2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation Stage 3: Presented for legislation/decreed Stage 4: Passed/approved Stage 5: Passed for which implementation has begun

Indicator	4.5.1-25 Number of households with formalized land
Definition	“Formalized” here implies that the user of the rural land, farm land, fishery, or water body has some type of formal government administrative recognition of the user’s property right of the land/water that significantly increases the tenure security of the resource for the owner. This measures households that, during the reporting year, received formal recognition by government institutions or traditional authorities at national or local levels of ownership and or use rights through certificates, titles, leases, or other recorded documentation. This can include secondary rights. The formalization process varies by project but can include the recordation or registration of a customary or informal right, as well as the regularization or adjudication of rights.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Although it is not the only approach, registration of farmland or fishing area increases the security of tenure over the land or fish stocks. This in turn increases the security of durable capital investments in the land that can have significant positive impact on agricultural productivity. Example capital investments include irrigation, cash crop trees, and soil and water conservation (e.g. terraces) or access to fishing grounds. Farmer/Fisher/Rancher households are more likely to invest in productivity enhancing durable capital investments when they have greater security of tenure.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	DATA SOURCE: Implementing partners records, in conjunction with the National Cadastral Service, or whichever entity records land rights in the government REPORTING FREQUENCY: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• The data for this indicator clearly represent the intended FTF result of improving households’ formal rights to land. • The implementing partners must gather data for this indicator through national records of formal land titling. The process may differ country by country as national systems vary. • Data collection for this indicator may be affected by bureaucratic systems and processes, impeding implementing partners from collecting current data. Managers should keep in mind that reported data may not be a precise reflection of an implementing partner’s progress towards an improvement of land titling. • Data reliability processes for data collection will remain consistent as implementing partners will collect the needed data from national records; however, any changes in nation’s processes for recording land rights could affect reliability. • Implementing partners will report annually; however, delays in government systems for recording land rights may create a lag in accurate reporting. However; annual collection of this indicator is

	most appropriate in capturing the rate of change.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	Sex of landowner(s) with the formalized rights: male, female, joint, and “firm owned” (if proprietorship is unknown or inappropriate to disaggregate)

Indicator	4.5.1-26 Average number of days required to trade goods across borders (average of export/import time)
Definition	This Sub IR indicator is from the World Bank's annual <i>Doing Business</i> report (see the indicator table in the back of the publication). It is a component of the "trading across borders" section, and is comprised of the components called "time to export (days)" and "time to import (days)". Add the average days to export + the average days to import of the first year before project implementation, which becomes the baseline. Then in every subsequent year, report the total number of days required to trade across borders (i.e. days to import + days to export) recorded for that year. The reduction can be calculated by comparing the difference between the baseline (not simply the previous year) to the current reporting year. The detailed methodology as to how the WB collects this data is reported in their methodology paper.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	One of the key elements to improving the policy environment is to make it easier to trade across borders. The Bank also includes an overall ranking for trading across borders, the number of documents needed and the cost to export or import (per container). There is usually a good correlation between these, but it is easiest to understand the number of days required for international trade. The development hypothesis is that speeding up international trade will provide an incentive to improve agricultural output. Because the poor are mainly in farming or agricultural sector activities, simplifying trade ought to improve the incomes of the poor.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number (of days) Calculation: Average of [the # of days to export and the # of days to import] Baseline (i.e. data from the year before USG intervention) should be entered in order to see how our interventions improve (i.e. reduce) the time it takes to trade across borders
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: World Bank's annual report on Doing Business (indicator tables in back of report) – available online here: http://www.doingbusiness.org/rankings Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• Data for this indicator clearly shows improvements in the enabling environment which is the intended results. • Data for this indicator is collected, analyzed, and reported by a team of economic experts of the World Bank, which is a highly reputable organization whose indicators are used by experts in varying sector throughout the world. They are the pre-eminent authority on tracking country economic progress. • This is a contextual indicator that helps us understand how our

	investments in policy are affecting the macro-economic conditions and a given country. It sets the context for accurate decision-making. • Data collection methods and analysis are very standardized and transparent. Limited changes would occur over time and reflect new understandings of current contexts as would be expected. Annual collection of this indicator is sufficient to inform management decision making.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline will come from the World Bank report of the year preceding when the implementation begins.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.5.1-27 Average percent change in score on key areas of organization capacity amongst USG direct and indirect local implementing partners
Definition	Annual % change in the capacity of local organizations measured across eight key capacity areas using the Organizational Capacity Assessment (OCA) tool. A copy of this tool is attached for reference. The key capacity areas include: • Governance • Administration • Human Resources Management • Financial Management • Organizational Management • Program Management • Project Performance Management • Leadership and Team Dynamics The average OCA percent change for an Operating Unit is the average of the percent change on OCA scores for each organization divided by the total number of organizations assessed. The average percent change on OCA scores for each organization would be $[(\text{current reporting year OCA score} - \text{previous reporting year OCA score}) / \text{previous year OCA score}] * 100$. An average has been chosen because it is recognized that the number of organizations USAID works with may change overtime. Operating units should retain data disaggregated by organization in their performance management plan files. In addition, each operating unit must include the assessment tool they are using, a description of the methodology employed for its implementation and the data source identified as the basis for the rating of each factor in their performance management plan files. For purposes of indicator reporting, at the time of the award a “local organization” must, • Be organized under the laws of the recipient country; • Have its principal place of business in the recipient country • Be majority owned by individuals who are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the recipient country or be managed by a governing body, the majority of whom are citizens or lawful permanent residents of a recipient country • Not be controlled by a foreign entity or by an individual or individuals who are not citizens or permanent residents of the recipient country; The term “controlled by”, means a majority ownership or beneficiary interest as defined at above , or the power, either directly or indirectly, whether exercised or exercisable, to control the election, appointment, or tenure of the organization’s managers or a majority of the organization’s governing body by any means, e.g., ownership, contract, or operation of

	law. “Foreign entity” means an organization that fails to meet any part of the “local organization” definition. Government controlled and government owned organizations in which the recipient government owns a majority interest or in which the majority of a governing body are government employees, are included in the above definition of local organization. For regional platforms the definition of a local organization can be expanded to include regional organizations that meet the following criteria: • Be organized under the laws of a country in the region served by the platform, • Have its principal place of business in the region, • Be majority owned by individuals who are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the region or be managed by a governing body, the majority of whom are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the region, • Not be controlled by a foreign entity or by an individual or individuals who are not citizens or permanent residents of the region. Both prime partners and sub awardees should be included Note: If an operating unit wishes to use an alternative assessment tool for example one generated through the human and institutional capacity development (HICD) methodology it should at a minimum include the factors identified in the OCA.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator directly tracks an outcome of USAID Forward IPR Objective 2: to strengthen local civil society and private sector capacity.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Average percent change of composite scores from one year to the next.
Use of Indicator	This indicator measures progress in actual local capacity development and will be used by USAID management to report on progress towards achieving USAID Forward local capacity development objectives.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The assessment score sheet collected in the field by USAID working directly with partner organizations to conduct annual assessments. Note: Specific data sources for each score for each factor in the assessment will be documented in the performance management files for each organization being assessed.
Known Data Limitations	While this is the indicator which most closely tracks actual organizational capacity, the variety of collection methods and possible tools present certain data quality issues. There is an issue of reliability. Within each operating unit reliability will depend upon rigorous implementation of a documented methodology for assessment. Across missions, USAID has determined that flexibility to ensure that the assessment tool corresponds as directly as possible to the particular needs and context of

	each operating unit is more important than reliability. However to minimize differences across operating units one tool, the OCA is recommended. Records will be kept by each operating unit for each organization assessed and will be aggregated only for reporting purposes. Data is also subject to interpretation bias and there is a possibility that the assessment is intentionally manipulated for political or personal reasons. Therefore each operating unit must document how they determine what level of capacity has been attained across each of the factors assessed and include data sources that can be verified.
Baseline Timeframe	Baselines will vary across missions and organizations. The baseline year should be documented in mission records.
Disaggregate(s)	None for reporting purposes however each operating unit should keep separate files to track the percentage change by organization; Numerator / Denominator

4.5.2 – Agriculture Sector Capacity

Indicator	4.5.2-2 Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance
Definition	This indicator measures the area (in hectares) of land or water (for fisheries) first brought under new technology during the current reporting year. Any technology that was first adopted in a previous reporting year should be marked as “Continuing” (see disaggregation notes below). Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related technologies and innovations including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation (e.g. carbon sequestration, clean energy, and energy efficiency as related to agriculture). Relevant technologies include: • Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including biodegradable packaging, • Biological: New germ plasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines; • Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides safe storage application and disposal of agricultural chemicals, effluent and wastes, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiency (e.g. soil organic matter); • Management and cultural practices: Information technology, conservation agriculture, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resource management practices that increase productivity (e.g. upstream watershed conservation or bio-diesel fueled farm equipment) and/or resilience to climate change including soil and water conservation and management practices (e.g. erosion control, water harvesting, low or no-till); sustainable fishing practices (e.g. ecological fishery reserves, improved fishing gear, establishment of fishery management plans); Integrated Pest Management (IPM), and Integrated Soil Fertility Management (ISFM), and Post-Harvest Handling (PHH) related to agriculture should all be included as improved technologies or management practices. Significant improvements to existing technologies should be counted. If hectares are under more than one significant improvement, only select the most important in order to avoid double counting.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Tracks successful adoption of technologies and management practices in an effort to improve agricultural productivity agricultural water productivity, sustainability, and resilience to climate impacts.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Hectares

Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing Partners will collect this data through interviews of program participants, direct observations of land, and report into program documents. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	- Indicator data appropriately represent the outcome of bringing land under improved technologies or management practices; however, those using the data should keep in mind that a program may not increasingly add hectares, but attempt to keep the same hectares under improved practices or allow land to lie fallow. Implementing partners may feel compelled to inflate numbers based on the nature of the indicator and perceived expectations. - Data quality assessments should be conducted by the missions to frequently and thoroughly to ensure reporting is accurate as possible and also set realistic targets. - Data collection processes are often complicated because reporting is based on smallholders' estimations of their landholdings, which may differ in units of measurement, which must be translated to hectares. The precision of their estimations is affected. While implementing partners should attempt to verify the precision of estimations, it is impractical to expect implementing partners to survey and determine each farmer's plot size and check against estimations. - Data for this indicator are to be collected using program documents, group surveys, and direct observations. That process should remain consistent throughout the life of the project. - Annual reporting of this indicator is appropriate for program and budget decision making.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	New vs. Continuing: - New—this is the first year the hectare came under improved technologies or management practices - Continuing—the hectare being counted continues to be under improved technologies or management practices from the previous year Technology type: - Crop genetics (including nutritional enhancement), animal genetics, pest management, disease management, soil-related (fertility and conservation, including tillage), water management, post-harvest handling and storage, processing, climate mitigation or adaptation, fishing gear/technique, and other

Indicator	4.5.2-5 Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance
Definition	This indicator measures the total number of farmers, ranchers and other primary sector producers (food and non-food crops, livestock products, wild fisheries, aquaculture, agro-forestry, and natural resource-based products are included), individual processors (not firms), rural entrepreneurs, managers and traders, natural resource managers, etc. that applied new technologies anywhere within the food and fiber system as a result of USG assistance. This includes innovations in efficiency, value-addition, post-harvest management, sustainable land management, forest and water management, managerial practices, input supply delivery. Any technology that was first adopted in a previous year should not be included. Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related technologies and innovations including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation (including, but not limited to, carbon sequestration, clean energy, and energy efficiency as related to agriculture). Relevant technologies include: • Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including biodegradable packaging • Biological: New germ plasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines; • Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides sustainably and environmentally applied, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies; • Management and cultural practices: sustainable water management; practices; sustainable land management practices; sustainable fishing practices; information technology, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resource management practices that increase productivity and/or resiliency to climate change. IPM, ISFM, and PHH as related to agriculture should all be included as improved technologies or management practices Significant improvements to existing technologies should be counted. In the case where, for example, a farmer applies more than one innovation as a result of USG assistance, they are still only counted once. Also, if more than one adult farmer in a household is applying new technologies, count all the adult farmers. This indicator is to count <i>individuals</i> who applied new technologies, whereas indicator #4.5.2-28 is to count firms, associations, or other group entities applying new technologies.

Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Technological change and its adoption by different actors in the in the agricultural supply change will be critical to increasing agricultural productivity which is the intermediate result which this indicator falls under.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing Partners will collect this data through interviews and direct observations during program implementation. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• Data very accurately represent the intended result of increasing the number of individuals adopting improved practices. • To reduce the possibility of implementing partners inflating numbers, mission staff should conduct field visits and spot checks of data collection processes. • Data are precise to demonstrate if an implementing partner is effectively increasing the adoption of new technologies. • Data collection processes are unambiguous and should not change. BFS will train on this indicator definition to ensure missions and implementing partners clearly understand the definition of what should be collected. • Annual reporting is sufficient for decision making.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	Sex, Type of person: • Producers (farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers, etc.) • People in firms (e.g., processors, service providers, manufacturers) • People in government (e.g., extension workers, policymakers) New/Continuing • New—This reporting year is the first year the person applied the new technology or management practice • Continuing—The person first applied the new technology or management practice in the previous year and continues to apply it

Indicator	4.5.2-6 Number of individuals who have received USG supported long term agricultural sector productivity or food security training
Definition	The number of people who are currently enrolled in or graduated in the current fiscal year from a bachelor's, master's or Ph.D. program or are currently participating in or have completed in the current fiscal year a long term (degree-seeking) advanced training program such as a fellowship program or a post-doctoral studies program. A person completing one long term training program in the fiscal year and currently participating in another long term training program should not be counted twice. An example is a USDA Borlaug Fellow. Agricultural productivity includes cultured and natural production (farmers, fishers, ranchers). Include training on climate risk analysis, adaptation, and vulnerability assessments, as it relates to agriculture, but do not include nutrition-related trainings, which should be reported under indicator #3.1.9-1 instead. This indicator is to count <i>individuals</i> receiving training, for which the outcome (individuals applying new practices), should be reported under #4.5.2-5.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Measures enhanced human capacity for policy formulation and implementation which is key to transformational development.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing Partners will review program documents to track individuals in long-term training programs. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• Data appropriately represents the intended results of increasing the number of individuals receiving education in the agriculture sector or in food security. • Data collection and analysis is unambiguous and straightforward. Mission staff should do data quality assessments of implementing partner records. • Data are precise and relevant to intended results and appropriate for decision-making. • Data collection and analysis methods are unambiguous and should remain consistent. • Annual tracking of this indicator is appropriate.
Baseline Timeframe	If projects are new, baseline would be 0. If this indicator is used, the baseline should be data from FY 2010.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.5.2-7 Number of individuals who have received USG supported short term agricultural sector productivity or food security training
Definition	The number of individuals to whom significant knowledge or skills have been imparted through interactions that are intentional, structured, and purposed for imparting knowledge or skills should be counted as training. This includes farmers, ranchers, fishers, and other primary sector producers who receive training in a variety of best practices in productivity, post-harvest management, linking to markets, etc. It also includes rural entrepreneurs, processors, managers and traders receiving training in application of new technologies, business management, linking to markets, etc. Training to extension specialists, researchers, policymakers and others who are engaged in the food, feed and fiber system and natural resources and water management. In-country and off-shore training are included. Include training on climate risk analysis, adaptation, mitigation, and vulnerability assessments, as it relates to agriculture. Delivery mechanisms can include a variety of extension methods as well as technical assistance activities. An example is a USDA Cochran Fellow. This should include training on food security, water resources management/IWRM, sustainable agriculture, and climate change resilience, but should not include nutrition-related trainings, which should be reported under indicator #3.1.9-1 instead. This indicator is to count <i>individuals</i> receiving training, for which the outcome, i.e. individuals applying new practices, should be reported under 4.5.2-5.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Measures enhanced human capacity for increased agriculture productivity, improved food security, policy formulation and/or implementation, which is key to transformational development.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public. This indicator can also be used for program managements and decision making in OUs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing Partners will review program documents to track individuals in long-term training programs. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• Data appropriately represents the intended results of increasing the number of individuals receiving education in the agriculture sector or in food security. • Data collection and analysis is unambiguous and straightforward. Mission staff should do data quality assessments of implementing partner records. • Data are precise and relevant to intended results and appropriate for decision-making.

	• Data collection and analysis methods are unambiguous and should remain consistent. • Annual tracking of this indicator is appropriate.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	Sex Type of individual: • Producers (farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers, etc.) • People in government (e.g. policy makers, extension workers) • People in firms, e.g. processors, service providers, manufacturers

Indicator	4.5.2-11 Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance
Definition	Total number of private enterprises, producers' associations, cooperatives, producers organizations, fishing associations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations, including those focused on natural resource management, that received USG assistance related to food security during the reporting year. This assistance includes support that aims at organization functions, such as member services, storage, processing and other downstream techniques, and management, marketing and accounting. "Organizations assisted" should only include those organizations for which implementing partners have made a targeted effort to build their capacity or enhance their organizational functions. In the case of training or assistance to farmer's association or cooperatives, individual farmers are not counted separately, but as one entity. This indicator counts the number of groups trained, e.g. a company training or association training.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Tracks the breath of USGs involvement in civil society organizations; a first step towards capacity building that is essential to building agricultural sector productivity.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public. This indicator is useful for program management and decision making.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners should track their involvement in program documents. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• Data clearly represent the first step output of USG assistance to strengthen civil society. • Implementing partners may attempt to inflate numbers through broad interpretations of the indicator definition. This should be addressed through mission close monitoring of implementing partners' workplan and reporting documents. • There may be some flexibility in the interpretation of this indicator given the numerous culture and social context missions are operating. BFS M&E staff will work with missions to ensure that missions have an appropriate understanding of the application of this indicator in their particular context. • Collection processes are simple and easy to keep consistent; however, collectors must be trained in the appropriate use of the definition in their particular context. • Annual reporting is appropriate for particular context.

Baseline Timeframe	If projects are new, baseline would be 0. If this indicator is used, the baseline should be data from FY 2010.
Disaggregate(s)	Type of organization (see indicator title for principal types) New/Continuing: • New—the entity is receiving USG assistance for the first time during the reporting year • Continuing—the entity received USG assistance in the previous year and continues to receive it in the reporting year

Indicator	4.5.2-12 Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USG assistance
Definition	Number of public-private partnerships in agriculture or nutrition formed during the reporting year due to FTF intervention (i.e. agricultural or nutrition activity, as described below). Private partnerships can be long or short in duration (length is not a criteria for measurement). Partnerships with multiple partners should only be counted once. A public-private alliance (partnership) is considered formed when there is a clear agreement, usually written, to work together to achieve a common objective. Please count both Global Development Alliance (GDA) partnerships and non-GDA partnerships for this indicator. There must be either a cash or in-kind significant contribution to the effort by both the public and the private entity. USAID must be one of the public partners. USAID is almost always represented in the partnership by its implementing partner. For-profit enterprises and NGOs are considered private. A public entity can be national or sub-national government as well as a donor-funded implementing partner. It could include state enterprises which are non-profit. A private entity can be a private company, a community group, or a state-owned enterprise which seeks to make a profit (even if unsuccessfully). A mission or a project may form more than one partnership with the same entity, but this is likely to be rare. In counting partnerships we are not counting transactions with a partner entity; we are counting the number of partnerships formed during the reporting year. Public-private partnerships counted should be only those formed during the current reporting year. Any partnership that was formed in a previous year should not be included. • An agricultural activity is any activity related to the supply of agricultural inputs, production methods, agricultural processing or transportation. • A nutritional activity includes any activity focused on attempting to improve the nutritional content of agricultural products as provided to consumers, develop improved nutritional products, increase support for nutrition service delivery, etc. NOTE: Each partnership's formation should only be reported once in order to add the total number of partnerships across years.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	More partnerships formed help leverage investments in targeted agriculture and nutrition activities. This will help achieve IR3 which then contributes to the Key Objective of agriculture sector growth. The improvement in growth will increase the incomes of all, but because the focus of project work is on the vulnerable (women, children and the poor) there will be a reduction in

	poverty.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public. Information will be used by operating units and central bureau for performance management and monitoring.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners will track the number of partnerships leveraged to report in program documents. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• Data appropriately represents the intended results of increase of public private partnerships due to FTF assistance. • Data collection and analysis is unambiguous and straightforward. Mission staff should do data quality assessments of implementing partner records. • Data are precise and relevant to intended results and appropriate for decision-making. • Data collection and analysis methods are unambiguous and should remain consistent. • Annual tracking of this indicator is appropriate.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is 0 as it is tracking FTF assistance and would not draw on previous year funding and performance.
Disaggregate(s)	Type of partnership (refer to the primary focus of the partnership): • Agricultural production • Agricultural post-harvest transformation • Nutrition

Indicator	4.5.2-13 Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions
Definition	A household is a beneficiary if it contains at least one individual who is a beneficiary. An individual is a beneficiary if s/he is engaged with a project activity or s/he comes into direct contact with the set of interventions (goods or services) provided by the project. Individuals merely contacted or involved in an activity through brief attendance (non-recurring participation) does not count as a beneficiary. Beneficiaries include the households of people who receive the goods and services of an implementing partner or participate in training, in which “training” is defined as individuals to whom knowledge or skills have been imparted through interactions that are intentional, structured, and purposed for imparting knowledge or skills. The definition of “rural” should be the definition used by the respective national statistical service. This indicator can include vulnerable households if they are in rural areas.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Tracks the breadth of reach of USG interventions in targeted areas.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public. Indicator will be used by OUs for program management and decision-making.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners will collect data from Project records, surveys, training participant lists, etc. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• Data clearly represent the first step output of USG assistance to rural households. • Implementing partners may attempt to inflate numbers through broad interpretations of the indicator definition. This should be addressed through mission close monitoring of implementing partners’ workplan and reporting documents. This indicator will need to be contextualized. COTRs will need to work with implementing partners to agree on the common definition. • There may be some flexibility in the interpretation of this indicator given the numerous culture and social context missions are operating. BFS M&E staff will work with missions to ensure that missions have an appropriate understanding of the application of this indicator in their particular context. • Collection processes are simple and easy to keep consistent; however, collectors must be trained in the appropriate use of the definition in

	their particular context. • Annual reporting is appropriate for particular context.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is 0 if it is not established. For existing programs, the baseline will be from FY 2010.
Disaggregate(s)	• By sex household type: female no male (FNM); male no female (MNF); male and female (M&F) • By Continuing vs. New households: Rural households reported as benefiting should be those benefiting in the current reporting year. Any households that benefited in a previous year but not benefiting in the reporting year should not be included. Taking the example of a benefit derived from technology adoption, if a household adopted last year an agricultural technology provided under a USG program and continued to use that technology in the current (reporting) year, then that household should be counted. If the household adopted the technology last year but was not using it during the current (reporting) year, then the household should not be included. Any household that benefited in the previous year and continues to benefit in the reporting year should be counted under "Continuing." Any household that benefited for the first time during the current reporting year should be counted under "New." No household should be counted under both "Continuing" and "New"

Indicator	4.5.2-14 Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance
Definition	A household is a beneficiary if it contains at least one individual who is a beneficiary. An individual is a direct beneficiary if s/he comes into direct contact with the set of interventions (goods or services) provided by the project. The intervention needs to be significant, meaning that if the individual is merely contacted or touched by an activity through brief attendance at a meeting or gathering, s/he should not be counted as beneficiary. Individuals who receive training or been involved from program-supported technical assistance or service provision are considered direct beneficiaries, as are those who receive a ration or another type of good. (An indirect beneficiary, on the other hand, does not necessarily have direct contact with the project but still benefits, such as the family members of the farmer who receives technical assistance or the population who uses a new road constructed by the project or the individuals who hear a radio message but don't receive any other training or counseling from the project.) • Beneficiaries include people who receive the goods and services of an implementing partner or participate in training, in which "training" is defined as individuals to whom significant knowledge or skills have been imparted through interactions that are intentional, structured, and purposed for imparting knowledge or skills • Household data will be disaggregated by the sex of the claimed or presumed head. The definition of "vulnerable" will be the definition used by the operating unit in formulating its Results Framework and activities. Possible groups include but are not limited to: HIV/AIDS sufferers, families and those affected by drought, conflict and low assets (poverty traps), single family head of household, marginalized ethnic groups, those vulnerable to climate change and variability, etc. Note that households counted under this indicator # 4.5.2-14 could be part of the total in #4.5.2-13, so that one would have "Number of rural households benefitting directly from USG assistance, of which x number are vulnerable."
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	It is a key tenet of FTF to bring in typically marginalized groups to inclusive agriculture sector growth. This indicator tracks the breadth of reach of USG interventions in targeted areas.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public. OUs will be able to use data collected in decision-making.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners will collect data from Project records, surveys, training participant lists, etc.

	Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• Data clearly represent the first step output of USG assistance to rural households. • Implementing partners may attempt to inflate numbers through broad interpretations of the indicator definition. This should be addressed through mission close monitoring of implementing partners' workplan and reporting documents. This indicator will need to be contextualized. COTRs will need to work with implementing partners to agree on the common definition. • There may be some flexibility in the interpretation of this indicator given the numerous culture and social context missions are operating. BFS M&E staff will work with missions to ensure that missions have an appropriate understanding of the application of this indicator in their particular context. • Collection processes are simple and easy to keep consistent; however, collectors must be trained in the appropriate use of the definition in their particular context. • Annual reporting is appropriate for particular context.
Baseline Timeframe	If indicator is new to a project, baseline is 0. If this indicator is not new to a project, then baseline is FY 2010 results.
Disaggregate(s)	• By sex household type: female no male (FNM); male no female (MNF); male and female (M&F) • By Continuing vs. New households: Vulnerable households reported as benefiting should be those benefiting in the current reporting year. Any vulnerable households that benefited in a previous year but not benefiting in the reporting year should not be included. Taking the example of a benefit derived from technical assistance for agriculture technology, if a vulnerable household received technical assistance on an agriculture technology through USG assistance last year and continued to receive that assistance in the current reporting year, then that household should be counted. If the vulnerable household received technical assistance last year but was not receiving it during the current (reporting) year, then the household should not be included. Any vulnerable household that benefited in the previous year and continues to benefit in the reporting year should be counted under "Continuing." Any vulnerable household that benefited for the first time during the current reporting year should be counted under "New." No vulnerable household should be counted under both "Continuing" and "New."

Indicator	4.5.2-23 Value of incremental sales (collected at farm-level) attributed to FTF implementation
Definition	This indicator will collect both volume (in metric tons) and value (in US dollars) of purchases from smallholders of targeted commodities for its calculation. The value of incremental sales indicates the value (in USD) of the total amount agricultural products sold by farm households relative to a base year and can be calculated based on the total quantity/volume (in metric tons) sold of a product (crop, animal, or fish) times the product price in the reporting year minus the total quantity/volume (in metric tons) sold of a product times the crop price in the base year. Except to determine the baseline, re-existing sales should not be counted; only incremental sales facilitated by the project should be counted. Note that quantity of sales is part of the calculation for gross margin under indicator #4.5—4, and in many cases this will be the same or similar to the value here.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Volume (in metric tons) and value (in US dollars) of purchases from smallholders of targeted commodities is a measure of the competitiveness of those smallholders. This measurement also helps track access to markets and progress toward commercialization by subsistence and semi-subsistence smallholders. Improving markets will contribute to the Key Objective of increased agricultural productivity and production, which in turn will reduce poverty and thus achieve the goal. Lower level indicators help set the stage to allow markets and trade to expand.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Volume (tons) Value (USD) From these 2 data points, system will calculate incremental sales automatically: [Volume (in metric tons) sold x Crop price in previous year] - [Volume (in metric tons) sold x Crop Price in base year] = Value of incremental sales in current year <i>Note: Convert local currency to US dollars at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period</i>
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public. Indicator can also be used by OUs for decision making.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners will collect data directly from farmers and, in some cases, cross-checked with recorded sales data by farmer's associations. Reporting Frequency: Annual

Known Data Limitations	• This indicator accurately represents the intended outcome of increasing sales of USG assisted smallholders. • Implementing partners may inflate numbers. BFS and missions will work with implementing partners on defined data collection processes. • Data for this indicator should be analyzed with the understanding that numerous variables beyond implementing partners control could affect the price and volume of products sold by smallholders. Data is useful for decision-making, but must be contextualized to be understood. • Collection processes for this indicator are standard and should not imperil the reliability of data. • Annual reporting is adequate for decisions making purposes.
Baseline Timeframe	For ongoing programs, baseline data should come from FY 2010 reporting, for new programs, baseline data will need to be established.
Disaggregate(s)	By Commodity Type: • Horticulture • Animal Products • Cereals • Oilseed • Dry Grain Pulses & Legumes • Roots, Tubers, & Other Staples • Other

Indicator	4.5.2-25 Number of people with a savings account or insurance policy as a result of USG assistance
Definition	This indicator counts the number of people who first acquired a savings account or insurance policy as a result of USG assistance during the reporting year. This indicator should only be used for programs with development objectives of increasing of access or utilization of savings accounts and insurance policy. A savings account refers to any type of an account in a financial institution that serves as a store of an individual's financial wealth as well as savings in traditional institutional structures such as community savings groups. An insurance policy refers not only to agricultural insurance in the case of crop failure but also any other type of insurance, such as property, fishing access rights, health or life insurance that cushions an individual/household against financial shocks that could otherwise potentially make the individual or household food insecure. Obtaining the value of a savings account can be difficult, and therefore will not be collected. The purpose of this indicator is to measure progress towards changed behavior of saving money as a buffer to the shock of income loss, and counting the number of savings or insurance accounts begins to measure this.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Food insecurity is often a result of financial shocks that may come from both agricultural production as well as loss of property or sickness or death of a household family member. Having a financial reserve in a savings account or an insurance policy is a means to buffer a household against these types of financial shocks that could leave the individual/household food insecure.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners should gather this data from program documents and through survey participants. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• Data clearly represents the intended result of increasing participants' access to insurance policies and savings accounts. • Implementing partners may attempt to inflate numbers. Missions should work with implementing partners to ensure they report only on those accounts or policies that are linked USG programs with the intended results. • Data are precise to measure program and performance although they should be contextualized within other economic variables. • Data collection processes are straightforward and should easily remain consistent. • Annual reporting is appropriate.

Baseline Timeframe	For ongoing projects, baseline would be cumulative sum of all previous reporting years of the project. For new projects, the baseline would be 0.
Disaggregate(s)	• Sex of account owner or policy holder (male, female) • Type of account-policy (savings, insurance)

Indicator	4.5.2-27 Number of members of producer organizations and community based organizations receiving USG assistance
Definition	A producer organization in this context is any grouping of people involved in agriculture including input suppliers, transporters, farmers, fishers, ranchers, processors, etc. that is organized around adding value to agricultural production. A community based organization (CBO) in this context is simply an organization involved in supporting any type of agricultural activity (including post-harvest transformation) and is based in a community and made up principally of individuals from the local community. USG assistance can include any help provided to either type of organization to expand coverage, services provided, information, etc. Some examples are organizational capacity building, training, other technical assistance, provision of supplies and materials, encouragement and motivation for improvements, etc. The indicator includes any person within the agricultural value chain who is a member of one of these organizations and received, directly or indirectly, USG assistance. This indicator counts the number of members within these types of organizations which receive assistance. It does not count the number of institutions, the amount of the assistance or the change in the value of agricultural commodities. Note that individuals counted under this indicator may also be part of households counted in the total number under indicator #4.5.2-13 (number of rural households benefitting), as applicable.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Helping the members of these institutions directly strengthens those organizations, which in turn will assist in improving the overall value of production in the agricultural value chain, improving productivity and contributing to a reduction in poverty, as most of the poor are in rural areas either as farmers, farm workers or workers in rural enterprises.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing Partner will collect from program documents tracking organization participation. Frequency: Reported annually
Known Data Limitations	• Data clearly represents the first step output of USG assistance to organizations. • Implementing partners may attempt to inflate numbers through broad interpretations of the indicator definition. This should be addressed through mission close monitoring of implementing partners' workplan and reporting documents. • BFS M&E staff will work with missions to ensure that missions have an appropriate understanding of the application of this indicator in their particular context. • Collection processes are simple and easy to keep consistent. • Annual reporting is appropriate for particular context.

Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	Sex, Type of organization (producer organization, CBO or “other”)

Indicator	4.5.2:29 Number of MSMEs receiving USG assistance to access bank
Definition	This indicator adds loans made (i.e. disbursed during the reporting year as a result of USG assistance) to producers (farmers, fishers, etc.), input suppliers, transporters, processors, as well as loans to MSMEs in rural areas that are in a targeted agricultural value chain as a result of USG assistance. The indicator counts loans disbursed to the recipient, not loans merely made (e.g. in process, but not yet available to the recipient). The loans can be made by any size financial institution from micro-credit through national commercial bank, and includes any type of micro-finance institution, such as an NGO.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Making more financial loans shows that there is improved access to business development and financial services. This in turn will help expand markets and trade (and ought to also contribute to IR1's expanding agricultural productivity) which will help achieve the key objective of inclusive (the MSMEs) agriculture sector growth (with agriculture sector being defined broader than just crop production). In turn this contributes to both goals of reducing poverty and hunger.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	U.S. dollars Note: Convert local currency to U.S. dollars at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public. OUs will also be able to use data for programmatic decision-making.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partner s will gather this data from project documents. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• Data accurately represent the intended result of increasing microfinance opportunities to producers. • Missions should track data quality through assessments to ensure that numbers are accurate. • This indicator is sufficiently precise • Data collection processes should be consistent and will not change • Annually reporting is appropriate for reporting purposes.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	• Type of loan recipient: producers, local traders/assemblers, wholesalers/processors, and others. • Sex of recipient person or organization: For producers, the sex of the person should be used to classify the recipient. For firms, if the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. For larger enterprises, the majority ownership should be used. When this cannot be ascertained, the majority of the senior management should be used.

	loans
Definition	Total number of micro (1-5) small (6-50) and medium (51-100) (parenthesis = number of employees) enterprises (MSMEs). Number of employees refers to full time-equivalent workers during the previous month. To be counted an MSME must have received USG assistance and have accessed bank loans or private equity. USG assistance may include partial loan guarantee programs or any support facilitating the receipt of a loan or other equity (e.g. an in-kind loan such as a tractor, plow or other equipment given as a loan). A bank is any registered financial institution including micro-finance institutions, commercial banks, and any other financial institution that makes loans. Loans could be given by informal lenders and in-kind lenders of equipment or other inputs (e.g., fertilizer, seeds) transport or food with repayment being in cash or in kind. Lenders do not have to be formalized or registered. The indicator does not measure the value of the loans, but the number of MSMEs who received USG assistance and accessed loans. Only count the MSME once per reporting year, even if multiple loans are accessed.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The lack of access to financial capital is frequently cited as a major impediment to the development of MSMEs, thus helping MSMEs access finances is likely to increase investment and the value of output (production in the case of farmers, value added for agricultural processing). This will directly contribute to the expansion of markets, increased agricultural productivity, and the reduction of poverty.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public. OUs will also be able to use indicator data for programmatic decision-making.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing Partner Frequency: Reported Annually
Known Data Limitations	• Data accurately represent the intended result of increasing microfinance opportunities to producers. • Missions should track data quality through assessments to ensure that numbers are accurate. • This indicator is sufficiently precise • Data collection processes should be consistent and will not change • Annually reporting is appropriate for reporting purposes.
Baseline Timeframe	For new projects, baseline is 0.
Disaggregate(s)	• Sex of owner of MSME (male, female) • Size of MSME (micro, small, or medium)

Indicator	4.5.2-32 Number of stakeholders using climate information in their decision making as a result of USG assistance
Definition	This indicator tracks decision-making among individual stakeholders with whom USG programs are specifically working to increase knowledge and use of climate information. Relevant climate data and information will vary according to the program context, but should be used by stakeholders (in the case of this indicator, defined as individual policy and decision makers) in the process of identification, assessment, and management of climate risks to improve resilience. Climate data may include monitored weather or climate projections (e.g., anticipated temperature, precipitation and sea level rise, changing frost-free dates, changing soil moisture and/or temperature, risk projections for extreme weather events, speed of soil erosion and water availability under future scenarios). Climate information might include the outputs of impact assessments, for example, the consequences of increased temperatures on crops, livestock, invasive species, pests and disease incidents, changes in stream flow due to precipitation shifts, or the number of people likely to be affected by future storm surges. If more than one individual from an organization is using climate information as a result of USG assistance, all individuals should be counted from that organization. Practices and actions will aim to increase predictability/ productivity of agriculture under anticipated climate variability and change.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The use of climate information reflects that decision makers understand the importance of engaging climate information for long-term sustainable planning for agriculture sector development. Appropriate knowledge and application of climate data is essential for sustainable agriculture sector growth. Tracking the number of decision makers using climate information is the first step in the process of tracking a country's progress in planning for sustainable growth.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public. OU may also use this information for planning purposes the next fiscal year.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing Partner will collect data through surveys with beneficiary stakeholders receiving capacity building and the use of climate information. Frequency: Reported Annually
Known Data Limitations	• This indicator adequately represents the result of increased sensitization of stakeholders in the importance of using climate information in decision-making. • Implementing partners may seek to inflate the data of this indicator.

	Missions should assess instruments used to collect data and conduct data quality assessment on reported values. • Data is precise, but management decision-makers should be aware that many intervening variables can impact the feasibility of stakeholders using climate information. • Data collection process with stakeholders is fairly simple, and can easily remain consistent. • Annual reporting is adequate for this indicator.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	Sex of stakeholder

Indicator	4.5.2-34 Number of stakeholders implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change as a result of USG assistance
Definition	There is strong scientific and evidence-based information that stakeholders (in the case of this indicator defined as “producers”) involved in sectors such as agriculture, livestock, fishing, other areas of natural resources can mitigate the effects of climate change by using appropriate new and tested management practices or implement measures that reduce the risks of climate change impacts. For example, risk-reducing management practices in agriculture and livestock might include changing the exposure or sensitivity of crops (e.g., switching crops, using a greenhouse, or changing the cropping calendar), soil management practices that reduce rainwater run-off and increase infiltration, changing grazing practices, or adjusting the management of other aspects of the system. Risk reducing measures might include applying new technologies like improved seeds or irrigation methods, diversifying into different income-generating activities or into crops that are less susceptible to drought and greater climatic variability. Any adjustment to the management of resources or implementation of an adaptation action that responds to climate-related stresses and increases resilience can be considered. Practices and actions will aim to increase predictability and/or productivity of agriculture under anticipated climate variability and change.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Increased use of risk-reducing practices are essential to improving resilience to climate change, which is intermediate result 5 in the Feed the Future Framework. Appropriately employing risk reducing practices is also vital for sustainable increased agriculture productivity.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public. OUs can also use this for tracking and management of their implementation mechanisms.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Field surveys by local project partners, including extension agents and farmer/producer organizations (and other types of organizations) Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• This indicator adequately represents the result of increased use of risk reducing practices/actions of producers to improve the resilience to climate change. • Implementing partners may seek to inflate the data of this indicator. Missions should assess instruments used to collect data and conduct data quality assessment on reported values. • Data is precise, but management decision-makers should be aware that many intervening variables can impact the feasibility of stakeholders using climate information.

	• Data collection process with stakeholders is fairly simple, and can easily remain consistent. • Annual reporting is adequate for this indicator.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	• Sex (male, female) • Type of Risk reducing practice: - o Agriculture – practices and actions will aim to increase predictability and/or productivity of agriculture under anticipated climate variability and change. - o Water – practices and actions will aim to improve water quality, supply, and efficient use under anticipated climate variability and change. - o Health – practices and actions will aim to prevent or control disease incidence and outcomes under anticipated climate variability and change outcomes. - o Disaster Risk Management – practices and actions will aim to reduce the negative impacts of extreme events associated with climate variability and change. - o Urban – practices and actions will aim to improve the resilience of urban areas, populations, and infrastructure under anticipated climate variability and change.

Indicator	4.5.2-35 Percent change in value of intra-regional trade in targeted agricultural commodities
Definition	This indicator tracks the direction and magnitude of annual change in the value of intra-regional trade in targeted agricultural commodities within a sub-region or regional economic community. The intent of this indicator is to monitor regional trade in selected agricultural commodities, even outside of direct USG attribution, and should be reported by the regional missions who historically monitor this information. Note that regional exports counted in the indicator #4.5.2-36 “Value of exports of targeted agricultural commodities as a result of USG assistance”) would be included in those counted here, while non-regional exports counted in #4.5.2-36 would not be counted here. “Region” should be defined by the regional mission, who can best determine the applicable countries involved in a trade region. Trade outside of this defined region should NOT be included in this indicator.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Increased agricultural trade is indication of expanded and more efficient markets, and Feed The Future intermediate result leading to agriculture sector growth. Note that this indicator is meant for reporting by regional missions, not bilateral missions.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public. This information can be used by OUs to track performance of projects with aligned objectives.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners will get the volume from relevant regional economic development community. The value of each commodity will be calculated by an M&E contractor or available national data. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• This indicator tracks the intended result of expanded and more efficient markets, especially at the regional level. • Integrity of data should be assessed as data will come from secondary sources and may be manipulated for political reasons. • This indicator is helpful for tracking the impact of USG programs on trade and policy reform as well as increased productivity; however, decision-makers should be aware that numerous external variables may affect regional trade outcomes. • Reported data and its reliability are dependent on the collection and analysis processes of their sources. • Annual reporting is appropriate; however, trends in this indicator should be tracked across several years to get a real understanding of market expansion.
Baseline Timeframe	For new projects, baseline is 0; however, the comparison year for FY 2011 reporting would be FY 2010.
Disaggregate(s)	

Indicator	4.5.2-36 Value of exports of targeted agricultural commodities as a result of USG assistance
Definition	This indicator will measure the value of regional and non-regional exports in U.S. dollar attributable to USG assistance. Exports should be counted against the baseline of existing export levels from the previous year (existing exports before USG intervention for the first year, or additional exports for subsequent years). Exports can include those within and outside of neighboring regions, so as to avoid loss of counter-seasonal exports, which often leave the proximate region. The commodities to be counted are those that are targeted in the work plans and/or contracts of the implementing partners. Note that these within-region exports could also be counted in indicator #4.5.2-35, which is intended to measure overall regional trade in certain commodities, even beyond USG attribution. In summary, indicator #4.5.2-35 collects trade ONLY within a region, but more than USG attributable, while #4.5.2-36 collects all trade within and outside of a region, but ONLY that which is USG-attributable. Non-U.S. Dollar currency should be converted to USD for reporting purposes at the time the project is completed, or (for an ongoing project) when reporting results. Missions should use purchasing power parity (PPP) for the current year to complete the currency conversion.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	U.S. dollar
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	U.S. dollar
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public. OUs may also use this data for performance monitoring.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners will get the volume from relevant regional economic development community. The value of each commodity will be calculated by an M&E contractor or available national data. Frequency: Reported annually
Known Data Limitations	• This indicator tracks the intended result of expanded and more efficient markets. • Integrity of data should be assessed as data will come from secondary sources and may be manipulated for political reasons. • This indicator is helpful for tracking the impact of USG programs on trade and policy reform as well as increased productivity; however, decision-makers should be aware that numerous external variables may affect regional trade outcomes. • Reported data and its reliability are dependent on the collection and

	analysis processes of their sources. • Annual reporting is appropriate; however, trends in this indicator should be tracked across several years to get a real understanding of market expansion.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline should be export value of commodities in year prior to program's commencement.
Disaggregate(s)	By Commodity Type: • Horticulture • Animal Products • Cereals • Oilseed • Dry Grain Pulses & Legumes • Roots, Tubers, & Other Staples • Other Trade Type: • Regional trade (value of exports sent within the region) • Non-regional trade (value of exports going outside of region) <i>Missions can use this disaggregate to help report on indicator #4.5.2-17 "Percent change in value of international exports of targeted agricultural commodities as a result of USG assistance"</i>

Indicator	4.5.2-37 Number of micro, small and medium enterprises receiving business development services from USG assisted sources
Definition	Total number of micro (1-5) small (6-50) and medium (51-100) enterprises (parenthesis = number of employees) receiving services from FTF-supported enterprise development providers. Number of employees refers to full time-equivalent workers during the previous month. Services may include, among other things, business planning, procurement, technical support in production techniques, quality control and marketing, micro-enterprise loans, etc. Clients may be involved in agro-processing, community forestry, fisheries, input suppliers, or other small businesses receiving USG assistance. Additional examples of enterprise-focused services include: • Market Access: These services identify/establish new markets for small enterprise (SE) products; facilitate the creation of links between all the actors in a given market and enable buyers to expand their outreach to, and purchases from, SEs; enable SEs to develop new products and produce them to buyer specifications. • Input supply: These services help SEs improve their access to raw materials and production inputs; facilitate the creation of links between SEs and suppliers and enable the suppliers to both expand their outreach to SEs and develop their capacity to offer better, less expensive inputs. • Technology and Product Development: These services research and identify new technologies for SEs and look at the capacity of local resource people to produce, market, and service those technologies on a sustainable basis; develop new and improved SE products that respond to market demand. • Training and Technical Assistance: These services develop the capacity of enterprises to better plan and manage their operations and improve their technical expertise; develop sustainable training and technical assistance products that SEs are willing to pay for and they foster links between service providers and enterprises. • Finance: These services help SEs identify and access funds through formal and alternative channels that include supplier or buyer credits, factoring companies, equity financing, venture capital, credit unions, banks, and the like; assist buyers in establishing links with commercial banks (letters of credit, etc.) to help them finance SE production directly. • Infrastructure: These services establish sustainable infrastructure (refrigeration, storage, processing facilities, transport systems, loading equipment, communication centers, and improved roads and market places) that enables SEs to increase sales and income. • Policy/Advocacy: These services carry out subsector analyses and research to identify policy constraints and opportunities for SEs; facilitate the organization of coalitions, trade organizations, or associations of business people, donors, government officials, academics, etc. to effect policies that promote the interests of SEs.

	Only count the MSME once per reporting year, even if multiple services are received.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator measures directly the sub-IR of access to business development services which contributes to the IR of expanding markets and trade. The IR impacts on the Key Objective of increasing agricultural productivity which will help achieve the goal of reducing poverty and hunger.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public. OUs will also be able to use information for programmatic decision-making.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	Partners may also seek to inflate numbers throughout the data collection process. To mitigate this, we will oversee the development of their data collection instruments to ensure quality and accuracy of collection. USAID will work to develop a precise timeline with each partner to ensure collection is well thought through and submitted in a timely manner.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	- Sex of enterprise owner(s): Male, Female, Most enterprises are likely to be small (or very small), probably single proprietorships, in which case the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. For larger enterprises, the majority ownership should be used. When this cannot be ascertained, the majority of the senior management should be used. - Size of enterprise: Micro, small, or medium, as defined above - Type of enterprise: Ag. producer, input supplier, trader, output processor, non ag, other

Indicator	4.5.2-38 Value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation
Definition	Investment is defined as any use of private sector resources intended to increase future production output or income, to improve the sustainable use of agriculture-related natural resources (soil, water, etc.), to improve water or land management, etc. The “food chain” includes both upstream and downstream investments. Upstream investments include any type of agricultural capital used in the agricultural production process such as animals for traction, storage bins, and machinery. Downstream investments could include capital investments in equipment, etc. to do post-harvest transformation/processing of agricultural products as well as the transport of agricultural products to markets. “Private sector” includes any privately-led agricultural activity managed by a for-profit formal company. A CBO or NGO resources may be included if they engage in for-profit agricultural activity. “Leveraged by FTF implementation” indicates that the new investment was directly encouraged or facilitated by activities funded by the FTF initiative. Investments reported should not include funds received by the investor from USG as part of any grant or other award. New investment means investment made during the reporting year.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Increased investment is the predominate source of economic growth in the agricultural and other economic sectors. Private sector investment is critical because it indicates that the investment is perceived by private agents to provide a positive financial return and therefore is likely to lead to sustainable increases in agricultural production. Agricultural growth is critical to achieving the FTF goal to “Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger”. Non-U.S. Dollars (USD) must be converted to USD for reporting purposes at the time the project is completed, or (for an ongoing project) when reporting results. Missions should use purchasing power parity (PPP) for the current year to complete the currency conversion.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	U.S. dollars
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public. OUs can use the data to inform program decision making.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partner will collect this data via surveys or interviews with private sector firms. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• Data for this indicator accurately reflects the intended result of increased private sector investment. • Partners may seek to inflate numbers in the data collection and reporting process. Mission should conduct data quality assessment.

	Decision makers should be aware that other factors encourage/discourage investment when using this indicator to track performance of implementing partners. It should be contextualized in the country's situation.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	4.5.2-39 Number of technologies or management practices in one of the phases of development
Definition	Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related technologies and innovations including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation (including carbon sequestration, clean energy, and energy efficiency as related to agriculture), and may relate to any of the products at any point on the supply chain. Relevant technologies include: • Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including packaging, sustainable water management practices; sustainable land management practices; sustainable fishing practices; • Biological: New germ plasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; biofortified crops such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines; • Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides sustainably and environmentally applied, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies; • Management and cultural practices: Information technology, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resource management practices that increase productivity and/or resiliency to climate change. IPM, ISFM, and PHH as related to agriculture should all be included as improved technologies or management practices. Significant improvements to existing technologies should also be counted; an improvement would be significant if, among other reasons, it served a new purpose or allowed a new class of users to employ it. Examples include a scaled-down milk container that allows individuals to carry it easily; anew blend of fertilizer for a particular soil, tools modified to suit a particular management practice, and improved fishing gear. <i>...in Phase I: under research as a result of USG assistance</i> New technologies or management practices under research counted should be only those under research in the current reporting year. Any new technology or management practice under research in a previous year but not under research in the reporting year should not be included. Technologies under research are as follows: • <u>For biotech crop research</u>: When technologies are under research, the process is contained in a laboratory or greenhouse; once the

	possibility of success is judged high enough, a permit is required to move to field testing. The change of location from a contained laboratory or greenhouse to a confined field and the receipt of a permit indicate that the research has completed the “under research” stage. • <u>For non-biotech crop research:</u> When technologies are under research, plant breeders work on developing new lines on research plots under controlled conditions. All research should have a target, often expressed in terms of traits to be combined into a specific cultivar or breed. When the research achieves “proof of concept” (by accumulating technical information and test results that indicate that the target is achievable), the “under research” phase is completed. Note that for crops, much or all of this phase might be conducted outdoors and in soil; these attributes do not make this work “field testing.” For non-crop research: “under research” signifies similarly research conducted under ideal conditions to develop the product or process. <i>...in Phase II:</i> under field testing as a result of USG assistance “Under field testing” means that research has moved from focused development to broader testing and this testing is underway under conditions intended to duplicate those encountered by potential users of the new technology. This might be in the actual facilities (fields) of potential users, or it might be in a facility set up to duplicate those conditions. More specifically: • For biotech crop research: Once a permit has been obtained and the research moves to a confined field, the research is said to be “under field testing.” • For non-biotech crop or fisheries research: During this phase the development of the product or technology continues under end-user conditions in multi-location trails, which might be conducted at a research station or on farmers’/producer’s fields/waters or both. Note that for crops, all of this phase would be conducted outdoors and in soil, but this is not what makes this work “field testing.” • For non-crop research: “under field testing” signifies similarly research conducted under user conditions to further test the
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The development of new technologies and management practices is essential for improving agriculture productivity, natural resources management, and climate change adaptability, all of which are long-term outcomes that Feed the Future attempts to address.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public. This indicator

	will also be used for program management and decision making in OUs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners will collect data from Project records, surveys, training participant lists, etc. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• Data appropriately represents the intended results of increasing the number of technologies and innovations under development. • Data collection and analysis is unambiguous and straightforward. Mission staff should do data quality assessments of implementing partner records. • Data are precise and relevant to intended results and appropriate for decision-making. • Data collection and analysis methods are unambiguous and should remain consistent. • Annual tracking of this indicator is appropriate.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	Phase I: under research as a result of USG assistance Phase II: under field testing as a result of USG assistance Phase III: made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance

Indicator	4.5.2-40 Number of hectares of agricultural land (fields, rangeland, agro-forests) showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance
Definition	"Improved biophysical conditions" are demonstrated where there is biophysical monitoring data showing improvement over a baseline measurement or stability, where baseline measurements of soil carbon are at optimal levels over time. This indicator measures the increase in soil carbon over time of land-based projects including farmland, agroforestry systems, rangelands, livestock, and forests. Soil carbon contributes to improved fertilizer use efficiency, rainwater infiltration and retention of soil moisture, thereby increasing long-term agricultural productivity and resilience. Increased soil carbon also provides co-benefits in terms of carbon sequestration and possible carbon payments. Soil carbon is directly affected by agricultural and agroforestry crops and is an indirect measure of biophysical condition of rangelands, where livestock, under planned [or managed] grazing, are essential for productive plant cover and improved water infiltration. While there is no globally recognized standard for measuring soil carbon, there are a number of scientifically valid approaches (Loss on Ignition, Combustion Method, Diffuse Reflectance, etc.). Missions may choose any scientifically valid method for measuring soil C. The indicator will be reported in terms of number of hectares but all measurement data on soil carbon levels should be recorded.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Improvements in biophysical conditions, mainly in soil carbon, allows for the tracking of climate change adaptability and the potential for increased long-term agriculture productivity. The standard of monitoring biophysical improvement permits demonstration of ultimate positive environmental impact as a result of USG interventions. Disaggregate according to management practices adopted facilitates using data collected for diverse reporting requirements.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Hectares
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public. OUs can also use this data for programmatic decision-making.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partner shall conduct a randomized, representative sample of land under improved management practices receiving assistance. Missions should ensure that language related to soil carbon monitoring, chlorophyll-A, or fish biomass be included in relevant procurement documents. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• This indicator accurately captures the outcome of improving natural resource management in the agriculture sector. • Implementing partners may try to inflate data by varying collection methodologies. Missions should conduct data quality assessments to

	ensure data are not being manipulated. • Data are sufficiently precise for performance management. • Data collection methods will need to be established by the mission with input from implementing partners. Missions will need to occasionally monitor data collection to ensure quality and methodology is still in place. • Because of the slow rate of change of soil carbon levels, biennial reporting is appropriate.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established.
Disaggregate(s)	The following improved technologies or management practices: • No/low till • Permanent soil cover • Integration of perennials into farming system • Water harvesting

Indicator	4.5.2-41 Number of water resources sustainability assessments undertaken
Definition	Water Resources Sustainability Assessments are evaluations of the water resources availability and use in a country. Attention is specifically devoted to environmental water requirements and sustainability of water use in the face of climate variability and change at the basin level
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Water is frequently diverted for different uses without sufficient consideration for the larger impacts of that use. As a result, basin level sustainability is often compromised and conflicts arise between uses and users in different parts of basins. To help mitigate this outcome, water resources sustainability assessments can foster a broader approach to integrated water resources management that facilitates more optimal and harmonious outcomes.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public. OUs will also be able to use information for decision making.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners will collect data through program documents. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• This indicator tracks the intended result of expanded and more efficient markets. • Integrity of data should be assessed as data will come from secondary sources and may be manipulated for political reasons. • This indicator is helpful for tracking the impact of USG programs on trade and policy reform as well as increased productivity; however, decision-makers should be aware that numerous external variables may affect regional trade outcomes. • Reported data and its reliability are dependent on the collection and analysis processes of their sources. Based on the straightforward nature of the reporting for this indicator; it is unlikely that implementing partners will be able to inflate data if missions perform data quality assessments regularly. • Annual reporting is appropriate; however, trends in this indicator should be tracked across several years to get a real understanding of market expansion.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	• Scale (basin-level, sub-basin level, field level) • Trans-boundary vs. national basins

Indicator	4.5.2-42 Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance
Definition	Total number of private enterprises (processors, input dealers, storage and transport companies) producer associations, cooperatives, water users associations, fishing associations, women's groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs), including those focused on natural resource management, that applied new technologies or management practices in areas including management (financial, planning, human resources), member services, procurement, technical innovations (processing, storage), quality control, marketing, etc. as a result of USG assistance in this reporting year. Only count the entity once per reporting year, even if multiple technologies or management practices are applied. Since these groups may be applying new technologies or management practices incrementally over time, only count those changes applied in this reporting year as a result of the USG project. Application of a new technology or management practice by the enterprise, association, cooperative or CBO is counted as one and not as applied by the number in their employees and/or membership. For example, when a farmer association incorporates new corn storage innovations as a part of member services, the application is counted as one association and not multiplied by the number of farmer-members. Any technology that was first adopted in a previous year should not be included. Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related technologies and innovations including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation (e.g. carbon sequestration, clean energy, and energy efficiency as related to agriculture). Relevant technologies include but are not limited to: • Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including biodegradable packaging • Biological: New germ plasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines; • Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides sustainably and environmentally applied, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies; • Management and cultural practices: sustainable water management; practices; sustainable land management practices; sustainable fishing

	practices; Information technology, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resource management practices that increase productivity and/or resiliency to climate change. IPM, ISFM, and PHH as related to agriculture should all be included as improved technologies or management practices Significant improvements to existing technologies should be counted
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Tracks private sector and civil society behavior change to increase agricultural sector productivity.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public. OUs will be able to use indicator information for programmatic decision-making.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partners will collect this data through surveys or group interviews with organizations. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• Data appropriately represents the intended results of number of organizations applying new technologies or practices as a result of USG assistance. • Data collection and analysis is unambiguous and straightforward. Mission staff should do data quality assessments of implementing partner records. • Data are precise and relevant to intended results and appropriate for decision-making. • Data collection and analysis methods are unambiguous and should remain consistent. • Annual tracking of this indicator is appropriate.
Baseline Timeframe	If program is continuing, baseline data would be from FY 2010 results. For a new project, baseline is 0.
Disaggregate(s)	Type of organization (see indicator title for principal types): • New (the entity applied the targeted new technologies/management practices for the first time during the reporting year) • Continuing (the entity applied the targeted new technologies/management practices in a previous year and continues to apply them in the reporting year) • Producer Organizations • Water User Associations • Trade & Business Associations • Community-Based Organizations • Private Enterprises • Women's Organizations

Indicator	4.5.2-45 Number of firms (excluding farms) or Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) engaged in agricultural and food security-related manufacturing and services now operating more profitably (at or above cost) because of USG assistance
Definition	To measure sustainable private sector investment, we will look at profitability of applicable firms and self-sufficiency of civil society organizations (CSOs) as a marker of viability. Although profitability or self-sufficiency measured during the period the USG is providing assistance does not demonstrate all aspects of a whether a business or a CSO will remain sustainably successful after withdrawal of USG assistance, it is certainly an important measure of its capacity to function effectively. Only the profitability of firms who are receiving USG capacity-building assistance that is intended to increase profitability or viability should be tracked. <i>NOTE: Non-profits should be measured by two standards: Operational Self-sufficiency and Financial Self-sufficiency. Operational self-sufficiency is defined as the margin, positive or negative, of recurring revenues above/below operating expenses (salaries, rent, utilities, supplies, all consumables.) Financial self-sufficiency is the margin above/below of all operating expenses and amortization and depreciation of permanent assets. One would like to see civil society organizations first on a path toward operational self-sufficiency and then from operational to financial self-sufficiency. This can be measured at the individual CSO level or for a cohort of organizations</i>
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	A main goal of local capacity building is to leave behind viable businesses and service providers to contribute to the economic growth of the agriculture and food-security sector. Profitability of firms and self-sufficiency of civil society organizations is one way to demonstrate that viability and sustainability of the businesses/firms/CSOs in which we invest.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/BFS) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Data will be used mostly by the Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management to report to the Department of State, OMB, Congress, nongovernmental stakeholders, and the public. OUs will be able to use information for programmatic decision-making as well.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data Source: Implementing partner should collect this data through review of program documents. Reporting Frequency: Annual
Known Data Limitations	• This indicator tracks the intended result of local capacity development. • Integrity of data should be assessed as data may come from secondary sources. • This indicator is helpful for tracking the impact of USG programs on local capacity development as well as increased productivity;

	however, decision-makers should be aware that numerous external variables may affect outcomes. • Reported data and its reliability are dependent on the collection and analysis processes of their sources. This indicator should also be contextualized to the country's environment as national policies and the economic/political climate may affect outcomes. • Annual reporting is appropriate.
Baseline Timeframe	This is a new indicator. Baselines should be 0.
Disaggregate(s)	Disaggregated by type of entity (firm or CSO) and level of profitability: For firms, • # of firms that were operating at a loss (costs>revenue) in the last business cycle before USG assistance • # of firms that were already operating profitably in the business cycle, but are now operating more profitably because of USG assistance (costs<revenue) For CSOs, There are 2 phases of CSO capacity/self-sufficiency: • Operational self-sufficiency (as defined above) • Financial self-sufficiency (as defined above) Disaggregate by where in the 2 phases the CSO is during the reporting year: • # of CSOs that were operating below the level of operational self-sufficiency (see accounting classifications above) in the last fiscal year before USG assistance • # of CSOs that were operating above the level of operational self-sufficiency but below financial self-sufficiency in the last fiscal year before USG assistance • # of CSOs that were already at financial self-sufficiency but which have increased their scope of operations or reduced their reliance upon third-party donor support or otherwise improved their ability to operate independently

4.6 – Private Sector Competitiveness

Indicator	4.6-1 Global Competitiveness Index
Definition	Missions are not expected to report on this indicator. The information is tracked by EGAT. The Global Competitiveness Index measures a country's relative level of economic "competitiveness." "Competitiveness" is defined as the, "collection of factors, policies, and institutions which determine the level of productivity of a country and that, therefore, determine the level of prosperity that can be attained by the economy." This includes indicators on the macroeconomic environment, regulatory environment, technology, quality of human resources, infrastructure, public institutions, domestic competition, and company operations and strategy.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator provides a reasonable proxy for firm level competitiveness, 6.2 Private Sector Productivity, while also capturing many of the regulatory issues captured under 6.1 Business Enabling Environment. The indicator seeks to measure the overall level of national competitiveness, with approximately 40% of the index based on firm-level productivity and 60% on regulatory/ government policy issues. The index is constructed based on a weighted average of close to 100 indicators, including both publicly available "hard data" and responses from a private-sector <i>Executive Opinion Survey (EOS)</i> that the World Economic Forum (WEF) carries out annually in collaboration with local universities. Weighting of indicators is based on the level of economic development of the country (GDP per capita).
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Index
Use of Indicator	This provides a global, qualitative indicator of the relative competitiveness of individual countries. It is an especially important indicator when developing economic growth programs. It can be reported as the percent of all USG-assisted countries with an increasing index score or a score = or > 4.5
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	WEF Global Competitiveness Report, which is published annually http://www.weforum.org/issues/global-competitiveness
Known Data Limitations	Limitations of the <i>EOS</i> include relatively small sample sizes and coverage limited to the capital/major commercial city.
Baseline Timeframe	2009
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

4.6.1 – Business Enabling Environment

Indicator	4.6.1-18 Formal sector employment as a percent of total employment
Definition	Missions are not expected to report on this indicator. The information is tracked by EGAT. Formal employment is calculated as wage and salaried workers, plus employers, and expressed as a percentage of total employment. (UNDP HDR definition)
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Formal sector employment can be used as a proxy for more productive employment, as opposed to informal sector employment which is generally (though not always) less productive and remunerative. Sustainable broad-based economic growth and increasing income per capita requires increased agricultural productivity <u>and</u> growth of more productive non-farm employment at rates faster than the growth of the labor force, and formal employment should therefore be increasing as a percent of total employment.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent
Use of Indicator	It indicates the extent to which the generation of more productive employment is catching up with or hopefully exceeding the annual growth of the labor force. If it is not, analysis should be undertaken to determine why not so that suitable remedies can be designed. It should be reported as the percent of all USG-assisted countries in which formal sector employment is increasing as a % of total employment or is = or > 80%
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	UNDP Human Development Report indicator, most recent data included in the Decent Work table of the HDR annual report. http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR 2010 EN Table12 reprint.pdf
Known Data Limitations	Labor force/employment surveys are not undertaken every year in many countries, so all years are unavailable for these countries.
Baseline Timeframe	Most recent data for 2008.
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	4.6.1-14 Number of municipal regulations and administrative procedures that have been simplified as a result of USG assistance
Definition	Number of municipalities assisted with regulatory/administrative simplification. Ease of doing business (including for example, registering businesses, obtaining licenses, permissions to engage in certain activities, etc.) contributes to economic growth. Regulatory and administrative requirements are not only at the state level, but at the local level as well. Hence, simplification of regulatory/administrative requirements at the municipal level will help spur economic growth.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Economic Growth
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Mission PMP; reporting
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Mission PMP; annual
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	As per availability in the past
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.6.1-15 Number of commerce laws and regulations simplified and implemented in accordance with international standards as a result of USG assistance
Definition	International commercial law is the body of law that governs international trade and foreign direct investment. Simplification and implementation in accordance with international standards is known as harmonization.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Economic Growth
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Mission PMP; reporting
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Mission PMP; annual
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	2011
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.6.1-16 Person hours of training completed in business enabling environment supported by USG assistance
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: Hours of USG supported training course x Number of people completing that training course Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training. Business enabling environment is defined as improving policies, laws, regulations, and administrative practices affecting the private sector. Includes reducing barriers to competition and unwarranted distortions to market prices; reducing policy and regulatory barriers to establishing, operating, and closing businesses; strengthening the legal framework surrounding property rights that is fair to both men and women, contract enforcement, and dispute resolution, along with the administration of those laws; reducing incentives for corruption and promoting transparent business practices; strengthening the legal framework surrounding intellectual property rights; and improving laws and regulations affecting the creation, dissemination, and use of technology. It also includes improving policies and regulations affecting technology choices and production behaviors with environmental impacts; and improving policies, laws, and regulations affecting hiring and firing of workers, wages, working conditions, and labor-management relations. Includes support for specific improvements as well as efforts to strengthen the institutions that contribute to designing and implementing further improvements.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number (of person hours)
Use of Indicator	Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity.

Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Attendance records of implementing partners that conduct training. Data are reported to the mission on a quarterly/annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Attendance records may be incomplete or inaccurate, especially in the case of determining whether a participant <i>completed</i> an entire course. The universe of countries providing this type of training can vary from year to year; thus, trends should not be interpreted from aggregate data.
Baseline Timeframe	The universe of countries contributing to this indicator varies from year to year based on mission goals and budget; thus, the baseline is established by each country when this type of training begins.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.6.1-17 Number of days of USG funded technical assistance in business enabling environment provided to counterparts or stakeholders
Definition	The provision of goods or services to developing countries and other USAID recipients in direct support of a development objective-as opposed to the internal management of the foreign assistance program. Services could include the transfer of knowledge and/or expertise by way of staff, skills training, research work and financing to support quality of program implementation and impact, support administration, management, representation, publicity, policy development and capacity building. Technical assistance includes both human and institutional resources. Technical assistance does not include financial assistance. Business enabling environment is defined as improving policies, laws, regulations, and administrative practices affecting the private sector. Includes reducing barriers to competition and unwarranted distortions to market prices; reducing policy and regulatory barriers to establishing, operating, and closing businesses; strengthening the legal framework surrounding property rights that is fair to both men and women, contract enforcement, and dispute resolution, along with the administration of those laws; reducing incentives for corruption and promoting transparent business practices; strengthening the legal framework surrounding intellectual property rights; and improving laws and regulations affecting the creation, dissemination, and use of technology. It also includes improving policies and regulations affecting technology choices and production behaviors with environmental impacts; and improving policies, laws, and regulations affecting hiring and firing of workers, wages, working conditions, and labor-management relations. Includes support for specific improvements as well as efforts to strengthen the institutions that contribute to designing and implementing further improvements.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Technical assistance supports institutional capacity building, a key goal for long term sustainability.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of days of technical assistance provided in each reporting period. Rounded up or down into whole numbers.
Use of Indicator	Convey the coverage and capacity building contribution of USG programs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reporting by implementing partners on an annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Validity: This indicator addresses only one of the limitations, exposure to concepts and systems that offer solutions to development problems or institutional gaps that prevent people from taking appropriate actions. Precision: Simply knowing the number of person days of technical assistance provided does not provide information about the quality and appropriateness of the technical advice provided,
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of people trained resulting from a project.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

4.6.2 – Private Sector Productive Capacity

Indicator	4.6.2-9 Number of private sector firms that have improved management practices as a result of USG assistance
Definition	This indicator measures the number of firms receiving USG assistance that improved their management practices (financial management, strategic planning, marketing, or sales) the past year. Firms improve their productivity, and in turn their competitiveness, by adopting improved management practices.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Economic Growth
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Mission PMP; reporting
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Mission PMP; annual
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	2011
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.6.2-10 Number of firms receiving USG assistance to invest in improved technologies
Definition	This indicator measures the number of firms that receive USG assistance to invest in improved technologies. Firms improve their productivity, and in turn their competitiveness, by accessing capital and increasing investment in productive assets.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of firms
Use of Indicator	
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Implementing partners
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	
Disaggregate(s)	Rural, Urban

Indicator	4.6.2-11 Person hours of training completed in private sector productive capacity supported by USG assistance
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: $\text{Hours of USG supported training course} \times \text{Number of people completing that training course}$ Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training. Private sector capacity is defined as improving the capacity of businesses to integrate into domestic and international markets through increases in productivity and improvements in corporate governance and the development and application of modern technology and marketing practices. Enhance the capacity of businesses and business associations in terms of their corporate governance capabilities and their application of best practices and technologies to achieve increased production and marketing of products and services. It includes adoption of efficient production processes, improved labor productivity, environmentally-sound management of natural resources and the development of accounting and management systems that can help the company and industry group implement business, labor, product and process standards that enhance business competitiveness. Business capacity development programs may include activities that help men- and women-owned firms and associations respond to these international markets and create regional alliances.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number (of person hours)
Use of Indicator	Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity.
Data Source and	Attendance records of implementing partners that conduct training. Data

Reporting Frequency	are reported to the mission on a quarterly/annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Attendance records may be incomplete or inaccurate, especially in the case of determining whether a participant <i>completed</i> an entire course. The universe of countries providing this type of training can vary from year to year; thus, trends should not be interpreted from aggregate data.
Baseline Timeframe	The universe of countries contributing to this indicator varies from year to year based on mission goals and budget; thus, the baseline is established by each country when this type of training begins.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.6.2-12 Number of days of USG funded technical assistance in private sector productive capacity provided to counterparts or stakeholders
Definition	The provision of goods or services to developing countries and other USAID recipients in direct support of a development objective-as opposed to the internal management of the foreign assistance program. Services could include the transfer of knowledge and/or expertise by way of staff, skills training, research work and financing to support quality of program implementation and impact, support administration, management, representation, publicity, policy development and capacity building. Technical assistance includes both human and institutional resources. Technical assistance does not include financial assistance. Private sector capacity is defined as improving the capacity of businesses to integrate into domestic and international markets through increases in productivity and improvements in corporate governance and the development and application of modern technology and marketing practices. Enhance the capacity of businesses and business associations in terms of their corporate governance capabilities and their application of best practices and technologies to achieve increased production and marketing of products and services. It includes adoption of efficient production processes, improved labor productivity, environmentally-sound management of natural resources and the development of accounting and management systems that can help the company and industry group implement business, labor, product and process standards that enhance business competitiveness. Business capacity development programs may include activities that help men- and women-owned firms and associations respond to these international markets and create regional alliances.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Technical assistance supports institutional capacity building, a key goal for long term sustainability.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of days of technical assistance provided in each reporting period. Rounded up or down into whole numbers.
Use of Indicator	To convey the coverage and capacity building contribution of USG programs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reporting by implementing partners on an annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Validity: This indicator addresses only one of the limitations, exposure to concepts and systems that offer solutions to development problems or institutional gaps that prevent people from taking appropriate actions. Precision: Simply knowing the number of person days of technical assistance provided does not provide information about the quality and appropriateness of the technical advice provided.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of people trained resulting from a project.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

4.6.3 – Workforce Development

Indicator	4.6.3-2 Number of persons receiving new or better employment (including better self-employment) as a result of participation in USG-funded workforce development project
Definition	Total number of people gaining employment or better employment within six months of participation in USG funded workforce development project. Better employment is based on the participant's perception of whether the employment is better. (It could be better because it is closer to home, has better pay, a better schedule, etc...)
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Increased employment and the improvement of employment quality (e.g., income, stability, working conditions) are the primary goals of the Workforce Development program element. This indicator is critical for identifying the contribution of improved workforce development to employment and economic growth.
Indicator Type	Program Element Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Indicates the effectiveness of the training provided in workforce training programs and whether the skills taught are marketable in the local economy. The percentage should increase from year to year as the training programs improve and the skills being taught become better aligned with the needs of local enterprise.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Implementing partner follow up with participants
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	2009
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.6.3-7 Share of women in wage employment in non-agricultural sector
Definition	Missions are not expected to report on this indicator. The information is tracked by EGAT. The share of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector is the share of female workers in the non-agricultural sector expressed as a percentage of total employment in the sector. The non-agricultural sector includes industry and services. Following the International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC) of All Economic Activities, industry includes mining and quarrying (including oil production), manufacturing, construction, electricity, gas and water. Services includes wholesale and retail trade; restaurants and hotels; transport, storage and communications; financing, insurance, real estate and business services; and community, social and personal services. Employment refers to people above a certain age who worked or held a job during a reference period. Employment data include both full-time and part-time workers whose remuneration is determined on the basis of hours worked or number of items produced and is independent of profits or expectation of profits.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Shows extent to which conditions for the participation of an essential segment of the population in economic growth are being created. Any form of discrimination is a drag on economic growth and economic prosperity.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent
Use of Indicator	Percent of all USG-assisted countries in which the share of women non-agricultural wage-earners is increasing or is already = or > 45%
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	UNDP MDG indicator from the International Labor Organization, Key Indicators of the Labour Market database, as reported annually in WB World Development Indicators (WDI), most easily obtained annually from EADS/ESDB at: http://esdb.eads.usaidallnet.gov/query/do?_program=/eads/esdb/source&source=WDI
Known Data Limitations	
Baseline Timeframe	2009
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	4.6.3-8 Number of workforce development initiatives completed as a result of USG participation in public-private partnerships
Definition	The kinds of public-private partnerships (PPPs) in which a USG agency may participate may include other USG institutions, U.S. non-profit private sector organizations, U. S. companies, and foreign government and non-governmental organizations and companies, in all kinds of combinations. All partners have common goals, and all have obligations for monetary or in-kind contributions, or both, involvement in program design and implementation, and all share the knowledge and experience that assures partnership success. Workforce development initiatives are cooperative investments in the human resources of a country or area through training or retraining for available or anticipated near-term workforce skills requirements. The objective is to endow workers with the skills needed to productively perform the tasks required for new formal sector jobs. Workforce development focuses especially on the technical training needed to prepare workers to accommodate workforce demands, and provide for themselves and their families.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Economic Growth
Indicator Type	Workforce development project outcome indicator
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	Mission PMP; reporting
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Mission PMP
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	2011
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.6.3-9 Person hours of training completed in workforce development supported by USG assistance
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: Hours of USG supported training course x Number of people completing that training course Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training. Workforce development is defined as assisting youth and adults in acquiring knowledge and developing skills beyond basic literacy, numeracy, and life skills, which are part of the basic education program, and behaviors to find legitimate jobs, establish viable self-employment ventures, and stay employed and productive in a changing economy. Create policies, programs, and systems that respond to labor market demands in the formal and informal sectors.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number (of person hours)
Use of Indicator	Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Attendance records of implementing partners that conduct training. Data are reported to the mission on a quarterly/annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Attendance records may be incomplete or inaccurate, especially in the case of determining whether a participant <i>completed</i> an entire course. The universe of countries providing this type of training can vary from year to year; thus, trends should not be interpreted from aggregate data.
Baseline Timeframe	The universe of countries contributing to this indicator varies from year to year based on mission goals and budget; thus, the baseline is established by each country when this type of training begins.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.6.3-10 Number of days of USG funded technical assistance in workforce development provided to counterparts or stakeholders
Definition	The provision of goods or services to developing countries and other USAID recipients in direct support of a development objective-as opposed to the internal management of the foreign assistance program. Services could include the transfer of knowledge and/or expertise by way of staff, skills training, research work and financing to support quality of program implementation and impact, support administration, management, representation, publicity, policy development and capacity building. Technical assistance includes both human and institutional resources. Technical assistance does not include financial assistance. Workforce development is defined as assisting youth and adults in acquiring knowledge and developing skills beyond basic literacy, numeracy, and life skills, which are part of the basic education program, and behaviors to find legitimate jobs, establish viable self-employment ventures, and stay employed and productive in a changing economy. Create policies, programs, and systems that respond to labor market demands in the formal and informal sectors.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Technical assistance supports institutional capacity building, a key goal for long term sustainability.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of days of technical assistance provided in each reporting period. Rounded up or down into whole numbers.
Use of Indicator	To convey the coverage and capacity building contribution of USG programs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reporting by implementing partners on an annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Validity: This indicator addresses only one of the limitations, exposure to concepts and systems that offer solutions to development problems or institutional gaps that prevent people from taking appropriate actions. Precision: Simply knowing the number of person days of technical assistance provided does not provide information about the quality and appropriateness of the technical advice provided.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of people trained resulting from a project.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

4.7 – Economic Opportunity

Indicator	4.7-4 Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger
Definition	Missions are not expected to report on this indicator. The information is tracked by EGAT. This indicator measures the percent of households experiencing moderate or severe hunger, as indicated by a score of 2 or more on the household hunger scale (HHS). To collect data for this indicator, respondents are asked about the frequency with which three events were experienced by household members in the last four weeks: no food at all in the house; went to bed hungry; went all day and night without eating. For each question, the following responses are possible: never (value=0), rarely or sometimes (value=1), often (value=2). Values for the three questions are summed for each household, producing a HHS score ranging from 0 to 6. The numerator for this indicator is the total number of households with a score of 2 or more on the HHS. The denominator is the total number of households in the sample with HHS data.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Please enter these two data points: • Percent of households in sample with moderate to severe hunger • Total population of households in zone of influence/targeted region
Use of Indicator	
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Population-based survey and official DHS data (see notes below). USAID/W will work to get these HHS questions incorporated into the DHS in applicable countries. Then, the DHS will also be able to show this data at the national level. Baselines and finals will be collected in a population-based survey conducted by the centrally-funded M&E contractor. Mid-term data may be collected, depending on budget levels.
Known Data Limitations	
Baseline Timeframe	
Disaggregate(s)	Gendered household type: female no male (FNM); male no female (MNF); male and female (M&F)

Indicator	4.7-5 Commercial Bank Accounts per 1,000 adults
Definition	Missions are not expected to report on this indicator. The information is tracked by EGAT. Number of commercial bank accounts per 1,000 adults
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The World Bank estimates that in developed countries, there are 3.2 accounts per adult and 81 percent of adults banked. By contrast, in developing countries, they estimate only 0.9 accounts per adult and 28 percent banked. In regression analysis, they find that measures of development and physical infrastructure are positively associated with the indicators of deposit account, loan, and branch penetration. This indicator also accounts for a large percentage of microfinance clients since most microfinance institutions (MFIs) are also regulated commercial banks. Therefore this indicator is a good proxy for economic opportunity in a country.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number of bank accounts
Use of Indicator	This indicator is used a proxy indicator for the level of “economic opportunity” in a country. Since it is measured at the country level, it is not attributable to USAID impact.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Consultative Group to Assist the Poor’s annual “Financial Access” report
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	None
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

4.7.1 – Inclusive Financial Markets

Indicator	4.7.1-12 Total number of clients (households and/or microenterprises) benefiting from financial services provided through USG-assisted financial intermediaries, including non-financial institutions or actors
Definition	The total number of borrowers, savers, and clients of other financial services such as microinsurance served by the USG-assisted intermediaries
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This is a standard output indicator in a results framework in which economic opportunity is the objective.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of clients
Use of Indicator	This indicator provides a reasonably comprehensive measure of the scale of impact, though clearly not the level of impact of the USG's microfinance activities.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Project, annual
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	N/A
Disaggregate(s)	Male borrowers, Female borrowers, Male savers, Female savers

Indicator	4.7.1-13 Number of financial intermediaries supported by USG assistance
Definition	Number of financial intermediaries supported by USG assistance serving poor households and microenterprises, including non-financial institutions or actors.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This is a standard output indicator in a results framework in which economic opportunity is the objective.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of financial intermediaries
Use of Indicator	Provides a basic measure of the scale of USG efforts to expand access to financial services among the poor and otherwise disadvantaged.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Project, annual
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	N/A
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.7.1-14 Percent of microfinance institutions (MFI) showing a positive return on average assets (ROA)
Definition	ROA measures how the MFI is managing its assets to optimize its profitability. Calculation Notes: Unlike Return on Equity (ROE), this indicator measures profitability regardless of the institution's underlying funding structure; it does not discriminate against MFIs that are funded primarily through equity. Therefore, ROA is a good measurement to compare commercial and non-commercial MFIs. Formula: Net income after taxes and before donations/Average assets.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This ratio provides useful information on an institution's prospects for profitability above and beyond reaching "break-even" point. Relationship to broader social performance indicators and industry trends: OSS and FSS ratios, which evolved as early and important sustainability ratios, have become less relevant within an MFI context. While OSS and FSS were once helpful indicators, once an MFI exceeded 100% sustainability or the breakeven point, the ratio became less useful as a measure of profitability. Return on Average Assets and Return on Average Equity are commercial measures better suited to analyze an established financial intermediary's profitability, including that of an MFI.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Percent of MFIs with positive ROA. Expected performance range: A mature MFI should generate a positive ROA.
Use of Indicator	If an institution's ROA is fairly constant, this indicator can be used to forecast earnings in future periods. This indicator provides useful information on an institution's capacity to be profitable as this relates to broader management capacity and prospects for long-term viability. Field and Bureau-level planners can use this indicator to recommend program changes and shifts in funding related to USAID technical and other support to increase the management and overall capacity of MFIs. This indicator can also be used to report on USAID effectiveness (or lack thereof) in promoting the growth of viable MFIs, which is a Congressionally mandated reporting item.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Project, annual
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	Annual baseline needs to be established.
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	4.7.1-15 Person hours of training completed by management and/or staff of financial intermediaries supported by USG assistance
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: Hours of USG supported training course x Number of people completing that training course Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training. Inclusive financial markets are defined as supporting equitable access to essential financial services (credit, savings, insurance, leasing, remittances and payment services) of diverse providers (including banks, credit unions, NGOs, non-bank financial institutions, buyers, and suppliers) to low-incomes families and female and male-owned micro-scale enterprises/activities.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number (of person hours)
Use of Indicator	Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Attendance records of implementing partners that conduct training. Data are reported to the mission on a quarterly/annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Attendance records may be incomplete or inaccurate, especially in the case of determining whether a participant <i>completed</i> an entire course. The universe of countries providing this type of training can vary from year to year; thus, trends should not be interpreted from aggregate data.
Baseline Timeframe	The universe of countries contributing to this indicator varies from year to year based on mission goals and budget; thus, the baseline is established by each country when this type of training begins.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.7.1-16 Number of days of USG funded technical training provided to management and/or staff of financial intermediaries
Definition	The provision of goods or services to developing countries and other USAID recipients in direct support of a development objective-as opposed to the internal management of the foreign assistance program. Services could include the transfer of knowledge and/or expertise by way of staff, skills training, research work and financing to support quality of program implementation and impact, support administration, management, representation, publicity, policy development and capacity building. Technical assistance includes both human and institutional resources. Technical assistance does not include financial assistance. Inclusive financial markets are defined as supporting equitable access to essential financial services (credit, savings, insurance, leasing, remittances and payment services) of diverse providers (including banks, credit unions, NGOs, non-bank financial institutions, buyers, and suppliers) to low-incomes families and female and male-owned micro-scale enterprises/activities.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Technical assistance supports institutional capacity building, a key goal for long term sustainability.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of days of technical assistance provided in each reporting period. Rounded up or down into whole numbers.
Use of Indicator	To convey the coverage and capacity building contribution of USG programs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reporting by implementing partners on an annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Validity: This indicator addresses only one of the limitations, exposure to concepts and systems that offer solutions to development problems or institutional gaps, that prevent people from taking appropriate actions. Precision: Simply knowing the number of person days of technical assistance provided does not provide information about the quality and appropriateness of the technical advice provided.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of people trained resulting from a project.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

4.7.2 – Policy Environment for Micro and Small Enterprises

Indicator	4.7.2-3 Number of improvements in laws and regulations affecting the registration and operation of micro or small enterprises drafted with USG assistance
Definition	Includes relaxation of zoning restrictions, other restrictions on microenterprise operations as appropriate to the country in question. Includes reduction in the number of steps required to become registered, the number and cost of documents needed, reductions in minimum capital requirements, improvement in the speed of processing, and other improvements as applicable in a particular country setting.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of laws and regulations drafted
Use of Indicator	
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Microenterprise Results Report and partner organizations
Known Data Limitations	
Baseline Timeframe	
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.7.2-10 Person hours of training completed by policymakers regarding the registration and operation of micro or small enterprises supported by USG assistance
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: Hours of USG supported training course x Number of people completing that training course Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training. Policy environment for micro and small enterprises is defined as reducing national and local barriers to registering and operating micro and small enterprises by improving the policies, laws, regulations, and institutions affecting these enterprises.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number (of person hours)
Use of Indicator	Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Attendance records of implementing partners that conduct training. Data are reported to the mission on a quarterly/annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Attendance records may be incomplete or inaccurate, especially in the case of determining whether a participant <i>completed</i> an entire course. The universe of countries providing this type of training can vary from year to year; thus, trends should not be interpreted from aggregate data.
Baseline Timeframe	The universe of countries contributing to this indicator varies from year to year based on mission goals and budget; thus, the baseline is established by each country when this type of training begins.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.7.2-11 Number of days of USG funded technical training in registration and operation of micro or small enterprises provided to counterparts or stakeholders
Definition	The provision of goods or services to developing countries and other USAID recipients in direct support of a development objective-as opposed to the internal management of the foreign assistance program. Services could include the transfer of knowledge and/or expertise by way of staff, skills training, research work and financing to support quality of program implementation and impact, support administration, management, representation, publicity, policy development and capacity building. Technical assistance includes both human and institutional resources. Technical assistance does not include financial assistance. Policy environment for micro and small enterprises is defined as reducing national and local barriers to registering and operating micro and small enterprises by improving the policies, laws, regulations, and institutions affecting these enterprises.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Technical assistance supports institutional capacity building, a key goal for long term sustainability.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of days of technical assistance provided in each reporting period. Rounded up or down into whole numbers.
Use of Indicator	To convey the coverage and capacity building contribution of USG programs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reporting by implementing partners on an annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Validity: This indicator addresses only one of the limitations – exposure to concepts and systems that offer solutions to development problems or institutional gaps -- that prevent people from taking appropriate actions. Precision: Simply knowing the number of person days of technical assistance provided does not provide information about the quality and appropriateness of the technical advice provided.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of people trained resulting from a project.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

4.7.3 – Strengthening Microenterprise Productivity

Indicator	4.7.3-6 Number of microenterprises supported by USG enterprise assistance
Definition	Includes microenterprises receiving assistance through a USG-supported value chain or supply chain, as well as microentrepreneurs receiving business development services or embedded services.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This is a standard output indicator in a results framework in which economic opportunity is the objective.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of microenterprises
Use of Indicator	Provides a basic measure of the scale of USG efforts to expand access to enterprise services among the poor and otherwise disadvantaged.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Project, annual
Known Data Limitations	This would be new data – but would have real value to planners, managers and Congress – in tangibly showing benefit.
Baseline Timeframe	Annual
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.7.3-7 Percent change in value of input purchases by microentrepreneurs (or smallholders)
Definition	Percent change in value of input purchases by microentrepreneurs (or smallholders)
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Input purchases as an outcome indicate that the microenterpreneur is willing to invest in inputs to improve productivity, suggesting that the value chain is growing to absorb new volumes and that the microentrepreneurs perceives the opportunity to benefit from these investments. If these input purchases increase over time, it is an indication of improved productivity, on the one hand, and a value chain system that offers incentives for microentrepreneurs to invest.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent
Use of Indicator	This indicator can be used by in-country program managers as well as Bureau-level planners to demonstrate to Congress that microentrepreneurs in USG assisted value chains are willing to invest their own monies in improving productivity. This is an indication of microentrepreneurs' perception of the viability of opportunities in USG assisted value chains.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	This data will be collected by most of the FTF project implementers. It will require surveys.
Known Data Limitations	This would be new data with value to planners, managers and Congress by showing tangible benefit.
Baseline Timeframe	Annual
Disaggregate(s)	

Indicator	4.7.3-8 Person hours of training completed by employees of microenterprises supported by USG assistance
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: Hours of USG supported training course x Number of people completing that training course Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training. Strengthen microenterprise productivity is defined as supporting the start-up and expansion of self-employment and micro and small enterprises owned and operated by low-income people.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number (of person hours)
Use of Indicator	Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Attendance records of implementing partners that conduct training. Data are reported to the mission on a quarterly/annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Attendance records may be incomplete or inaccurate, especially in the case of determining whether a participant <i>completed</i> an entire course. The universe of countries providing this type of training can vary from year to year; thus, trends should not be interpreted from aggregate data.
Baseline Timeframe	The universe of countries contributing to this indicator varies from year to year based on mission goals and budget; thus, the baseline is established by each country when this type of training begins.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.7.3-9 Number of days of USG funded technical assistance provided to employees of microenterprises
Definition	The provision of goods or services to developing countries and other USAID recipients in direct support of a development objective-as opposed to the internal management of the foreign assistance program. Services could include the transfer of knowledge and/or expertise by way of staff, skills training, research work and financing to support quality of program implementation and impact, support administration, management, representation, publicity, policy development and capacity building. Technical assistance includes both human and institutional resources. Technical assistance does not include financial assistance. Strengthen microenterprise productivity is defined as supporting the start-up and expansion of self-employment and micro and small enterprises owned and operated by low-income people.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Technical assistance supports institutional capacity building, a key goal for long term sustainability.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of days of technical assistance provided in each reporting period. Rounded up or down into whole numbers.
Use of Indicator	To convey the coverage and capacity building contribution of USG programs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reporting by implementing partners on an annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Validity: This indicator addresses only one of the limitations, exposure to concepts and systems that offer solutions to development problems or institutional gaps that prevent people from taking appropriate actions. Precision: Simply knowing the number of person days of technical assistance provided does not provide information about the quality and appropriateness of the technical advice provided.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of people trained resulting from a project.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

4.7.4 –Inclusive Economic Law and Property Rights

Indicator	4.7.4-4 International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) Access to Land Indicator
Definition	Missions are not expected to report on this indicator. The information is tracked by EGAT. Expert provide scores for each country by evaluating them on five criteria: Access to land for rural poor households; Access to land for women/vulnerable groups; Security of tenure; Formalization land markets, and Management of common property resources.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The goals of inclusive economic law and property rights, as well as property rights for the poor, encompass a range of aspects that are not readily captured by any single objective indicator. The five areas included in the IFAD indicator are an analytically sound set of criteria upon which to evaluate the effectiveness of the property rights system in facilitating inclusive economic growth.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Countries are evaluated on a 1 to 6 scale
Use of Indicator	The indicator will be used as one means to evaluate overall progress towards the goal of a property rights system that facilitates inclusive economic growth.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The indicator is compiled by IFAD as part of its Performance Based Allocation System (PBAS), available here: http://www.ifad.org/operations/pbas/index.htm. The index is compiled for a wide range of countries and is released on an annual basis.
Known Data Limitations	A disadvantage of the indicator is that it is an expert assessment, rather than an objective and observable indicator. However, IFAD undertakes a rigorous process of ensuring that expert are provided with objective criteria upon which to base their scores, as well as a thorough review process to corroborate each assessment and ensure cross-country comparability.
Baseline Timeframe	The baselines vary by country, but in most cases IFAD has been compiling the indicator for at least 5 years
Disaggregate(s)	The indicator cannot be disaggregated but explicitly includes consideration of women, the poor, and vulnerable groups.

Indicator	4.7.4-5 Number of households who have obtained documented property rights as result of USG assistance
Definition	Number of landholding households that receive documentation of property rights in the form of certificates, land titles, or other property documents as a result of USG programs that are designed to provide such documents
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Insecure property rights and overlapping claims to property inhibit agricultural investment and productivity and spur conflict. Documentation of property rights is an important step in clarifying ownership in a way that leads to greater tenure security and hence investment and reduced conflict.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of households obtaining documents
Use of Indicator	This indicator will enable USAID contractors, COTRs, and host country governments to monitor progress on a range of projects that seek to provide documented property rights.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The data will be collected from the administrative entity responsible for distributing documentation of property rights; the nature of this entity will vary depending on the particular project under consideration.
Known Data Limitations	While documentation is one aspect of a more secure property rights system, it is important to bear in mind that in many cases documentation is only effective if accompanied by broader institutional reform, which could be a source of misunderstanding. Therefore, it will be important to communicate to stakeholders and others that this indicator is intended to measure progress along one dimension of the property rights system, rather than progress along the property rights system as a whole.
Baseline Timeframe	Baselines will vary depending on USAID project sites.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.7.4-6 Number of land governance actors receiving USG-funded training or upgraded facilities/equipment
Definition	Number of government officials, traditional authorities, and community representatives who participate in trainings or receive upgraded equipment or facilities with which to carry out their duties
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	An important component of land tenure security, conflict reduction, and the development of efficient land markets is the performance of the actors responsible for allocating and administering land rights, resolving disputes, maintaining records, and other land-related functions. To the extent that USG assistance enables these actors to better carry out their functions, this is an important contribution to the broader goal of land tenure security and hence economic growth and reduced conflict.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of land governance actors
Use of Indicator	This indicator will enable USAID contractors, COTRs, and host country governments to monitor progress on a range of projects that seek to build the capacity of land governance actors
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The data will be collected from project documents indicating the number of actors trained or receiving upgraded equipment and/or facilities
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	Baselines will vary depending on USAID project sites
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.7.4-7 Number of previously existing land and natural resource-based conflicts resolved in favor of the protection of the most vulnerable populations and local communities involved in areas receiving USG assistance for land conflict mitigation
Definition	In areas where programming relates to dispute resolution training and related activities, a baseline of pending land conflicts will be taken prior to project activities, and the number of conflicts that are resolved during the course of the project will be noted. Land and natural resource based conflicts are defined as disputes between two or more parties that require the adjudication of the third party and pertain to one or more of the following: • Overlapping or contradictory claims over a particular area of land, • Disputes over the authority to assign property or adjudicate disputes in a particular area, • Disputes related to inheritance or other transfers of land, • Violation of property rights, such as unauthorized access or use, damage, etc. • Unauthorized encroachment onto land designated for other purposes such as livestock corridors, protected areas, etc.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Land conflicts are an important source of social unrest, and have economic consequences as well in the form of reduced tenure security, limited investment and damage to property. Where land conflicts can be resolved, tenure security and economic outcomes are improved, and the potential for land conflicts to spill over into broader civil conflicts is reduced.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of conflict resolved
Use of Indicator	This indicator will enable USAID contractors, COTRs, and host country governments to monitor progress on a range of projects that seek to reduce the incidence of land conflict.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The data will be collected by identifying the administrative units that resolve land conflicts, and collecting data from them both before and after projects.
Known Data Limitations	In many contexts, there are multiple levels at which conflicts are adjudicated, many of which are informal. As a result, rather than relying on government or court records, attention will need to be devoted to identifying the relevant authorities on a case-by-case basis so that data can be collected at all appropriate levels.
Baseline Timeframe	Baselines will vary depending on USAID project sites
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.7.4-8 Person hours of training completed by government officials, traditional authority, or individuals related to land tenure and property rights supported by USG assistance
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: $\text{Hours of USG supported training course} \times \text{Number of people completing that training course}$ Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training. Inclusive economic law and property rights is defined as ensuring that poor people, women, and other disadvantaged groups have equal legal rights and protection in economic matters.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number (of person hours)
Use of Indicator	Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Attendance records of implementing partners that conduct training. Data are reported to the mission on a quarterly/annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Attendance records may be incomplete or inaccurate, especially in the case of determining whether a participant <i>completed</i> an entire course. The universe of countries providing this type of training can vary from year to year; thus, trends should not be interpreted from aggregate data.
Baseline Timeframe	The universe of countries contributing to this indicator varies from year to year based on mission goals and budget; thus, the baseline is established by each country when this type of training begins.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.7.4-9 Number of days of USG funded technical assistance on land tenure and property rights issues provided to counterparts or stakeholders
Definition	The provision of goods or services to developing countries and other USAID recipients in direct support of a development objective-as opposed to the internal management of the foreign assistance program. Services could include the transfer of knowledge and/or expertise by way of staff, skills training, research work and financing to support quality of program implementation and impact, support administration, management, representation, publicity, policy development and capacity building. Technical assistance includes both human and institutional resources. Technical assistance does not include financial assistance. Inclusive economic law and property rights is defined as ensuring that poor people, women, and other disadvantaged groups have equal legal rights and protection in economic matters.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Technical assistance supports institutional capacity building, a key goal for long term sustainability.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of days of technical assistance provided in each reporting period. Rounded up or down into whole numbers.
Use of Indicator	To convey the coverage and capacity building contribution of USG programs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reporting by implementing partners on an annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Validity: This indicator addresses only one of the limitations – exposure to concepts and systems that offer solutions to development problems or institutional gaps -- that prevent people from taking appropriate actions. Precision: Simply knowing the number of person days of technical assistance provided does not provide information about the quality and appropriateness of the technical advice provided.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of people trained resulting from a project.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

4.8 - Environment

Indicator	4.8-7 Quantity of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, measured in metric tons of CO2e, reduced or sequestered as a result of USG assistance
Definition	The CO2e emissions reduced or sequestered as a result of USG programs in climate change, natural resource management, agriculture, biodiversity, energy, industry, urban, transport and other relevant sectors.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Reducing GHG emissions have long-term impacts on slowing climate change, and global implications for the extent of impacts. Reducing GHG emissions can also have strong ancillary benefits for pollution, security, health, and women.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Metric tons CO2 equivalent (annual)
Use of Indicator	Reporting and accountability by in-country program implementers. Progress will be noted at UNFCCC international climate change negotiations, will be used to capture the impact of USAID's GCC portfolio for domestic and international audiences.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data provided by USAID implementers as part of standard reporting procedures through, for example, quarterly and annual reports. The data source should most often be original, project- or program-level information. Calculations should be completed using a commonly accepted GHG accounting methodology. For land use-related emissions: USAID has developed the Agriculture, Forest, and Other Land Use Carbon Calculator using standard methodologies and some default data: http://winrock.stage.datarg.net/CarbonReporting OUs should as a first option, use this calculator. For situations which do not lend themselves to the calculator, OUs should contact USAID's Global Climate Change (GCC) team. NOTE: Regarding land use-related reduced emissions or increased sequestration, if U.S. government supported project continues to conserve the same hectares of land as in a previous year, those hectares should be included in the calculations for the current year to determine the annual emissions reductions of the project. For energy and other non-land use sectors: EGAT is in the process of developing a standardized GHG accounting methodology to assist and guide OUs in reporting on this indicator. In addition, several outside sources exist that provide data, methodologies or tools for measuring GHG emissions reductions, some of which are linked below. For additional tool ideas, please contact the indicator POC. The UNFCCC provides a list of various sources of emissions data, including links to data sets, here: http://unfccc.int/ghg_data/ghg_data_non_unfccc/items/3170.php World Resources Institute (WRI) supports three relevant databases and

	tools: • Earthtrends, a searchable database with data on energy and environmental data: http://earthtrends.wri.org/ • Climate Analysis Indicators Tool - a set of comprehensive and comparable greenhouse gas inventories, together with other climate-relevant indicators: http://www.wri.org/project/cait • Greenhouse Gas Protocol for project or corporate GHG accounting: http://www.ghgprotocol.org/
Known Data Limitations	Integrity: Several different methodologies could be employed to calculate this indicator, which offers the potential for data manipulation to show the most favorable results. To avoid this situation, methods for calculating emissions should be clearly documented and easy to understand. Precision: There could be some imprecision due to variances in reporting methodologies. This is currently being addressed through new standardized GHG accounting methodology, which will be provided to OUs as soon as it is complete. Reliability: Data collection and analysis may be inconsistent if a consistent methodology is not applied.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is zero at the inception of activities. What is important is the effect of the overall program with respect to emissions reduced or sequestered.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.8-9 Increase in ratio of territory under protected status to the target of 10 percent of the area, for all biomes in a country
Definition	Missions are not expected to report on this indicator. The information is tracked by EGAT. This is one of four indicators contributing to a composite Natural Resource Management Index calculated annually for 157 countries. For each biome in each country, CIESIN calculates 10 % of its total area, and then calculates the actual land area under protected status for that biome. They then take the ratio of the land under protected status to the target of 10 % of the biome's area. If the area protected is equal to or greater than 10 % of the biome, then the country receives a score of 1 for that biome. If only 5 % is protected, the country receives a score of 0.5. The ratios for each biome are then averaged using a simple arithmetic average. For a country comprised of two equal-sized ecoregions, in which one is 50 % protected and the other is 5 % protected, the score is 0.75. The proximity-to-target score of the first is 1.0 (cannot exceed 100 %) and the score of the second is 0.5. The arithmetic average is $(1+0.5)/2 = 0.75$. The numerator is the weighted average percentage of area under protected status, for all biomes in a country, not to exceed 10 %; the denominator is 10 %, the target for protection.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator assesses whether a country is protecting at least 10 % of all of its biomes (e.g. deserts, forests, grasslands, aquatic, and tundra). It is designed to capture the comprehensiveness of a government's commitment to habitat preservation and biodiversity protection.
Indicator Type	Contextual
Unit of Measure	Percent, expressed as a ratio from 0 – 1 (eg. 50 % = 0.5). The number is specific to the year.
Use of Indicator	Under the Convention on Biological Diversity, the world's governments set a goal of protecting 10 % of all ecological regions by 2010. This indicator assesses whether a country is protecting at least 10 % of all of its biomes (e.g. deserts, forests, grasslands, aquatic, and tundra). It is designed to capture the comprehensiveness of a government's commitment to habitat preservation and biodiversity protection. Many USAID biodiversity programs contribute to protected area designations and management, making this indicator a useful measure of Agency achievement. The use of this indicator also promotes consistency across USG foreign assistance efforts since the Millennium Challenge Corporation has also adopted it.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data source: CIESIN, Center for International Earth Science Information Network. Data for most recent and all previous years is available here: http://sedac.ciesin.columbia.edu/es/mcc.html Reported annually for each biome in each country, CIESIN calculates 10 % of its total area, and then calculates the actual land area under protected status for that biome. They then take the ratio of the land under protected status to the target of 10 % of the biome's area. If the area protected is equal to or greater than 10 % of the biome, then the country receives a score of 1 for that biome. If only 5 % is protected, the country receives a

	score of 0.5. The ratios for each biome are then averaged using a simple arithmetic average. World Wildlife Fund provides the underlying biome data, and the United Nations Environment Program World Conservation Monitoring Center provide the underlying data on protected areas. Methods are described further here: http://www.ciesin.columbia.edu/repository/esi/docs/ecoregion_protection_methodology_2010.pdf
Known Data Limitations	Validity and integrity are high. Precision increases with every year as protected area boundaries become more detailed. Reliability is high. Data collection did change when in 2009 a decision to exclude International Protected Areas was made, but results from 2006, 2007 and 2008 were revised accordingly. International Protected Areas (eg. Ramsar Sites) typically include nationally designated areas, but areas which are not under formal protected status are not appropriately labeled "protected." Timeliness (annual) is appropriate for a context indicator.
Baseline Timeframe	2006
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

4.8.1 – Natural Resources and Biodiversity

Indicator	4.8.1-1 Number of hectares of biological significance and/or natural resources showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance
Definition	“Improved biophysical conditions” are demonstrated where there is biophysical monitoring data showing improvement, stability if previously declining, or a slower rate of decline in one or more natural resources over time. Reported as total number of hectares improved during the fiscal year in question, which can include maintained improvement in previously reported hectares and/or new, additional hectares. This indicator should be a subset of “Number of hectares under improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance” if the latter is reported; double counting is allowed. Higher = better Reported as total number of hectares improved during the fiscal year in question, which can include maintained improvement in previously reported hectares and/or new, additional hectares. Improved biophysical condition should be reported for activities where the USAID supported program was plausibly linked to the improvements observed. Partners should articulate clearly the benchmarks that are being used within the program to gauge success, and provide a short narrative to describe the benchmarks that have been reached in the past year.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	A spatial indicator is an appropriate measure of the scale of impact of biodiversity conservation and/or NRM interventions. Improving biophysical conditions is a goal of most site-based conservation and natural resource management programs.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Hectares
Use of Indicator	Measures of this indicator demonstrate the highest level of conservation effectiveness and can inform adaptive management of programs. Disaggregation by “biologically significant areas” facilitates biodiversity compliance review led by USAID Biodiversity Technical Earmark Group, as well as Congressional reporting.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Implementing partner(s) measure biophysical change using techniques and frequency appropriate to the resource(s) being measured. Direct observation is the usual but not the only method of data collection. Data collection methods include: remote sensing; soil and water sampling; wildlife and botanical surveys; etc.
Known Data Limitations	Precision depends on the methods used, such as whether sampling is representative of whole area of intervention. Reliability is strong but comparability across different sites and different resources (and in different ecological zones) is difficult. Biophysical change may or may not be detectable on an annual basis or even within the project cycle. Stability where it didn’t exist before is also within the definition of biophysical change.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.8.1-6 Number of people with increased economic benefits derived from sustainable natural resource management and conservation as a result of USG assistance
Definition	Number of people may be a direct count, or it may be determined by multiplying number of households with increased economic benefits by the number of people per household. Increased economic benefits are increases in economic earnings or consumption due to sustainable management or conservation of natural resources, which can include wages, communal revenues, non-cash benefits, and economic benefits from ecosystem services. Higher = Better Number is specific to each year, not cumulative
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator links sustainable natural resources management to economic growth and social development objectives. When people receive tangible economic benefits from natural resource management or conservation, they are more likely to value and support these activities into the future, well after the project ends, creating a sustainable impact.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number of people
Use of Indicator	This measure demonstrates project reach and may be reported in aggregate to Congress or other stakeholders.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Implementing partners report this indicator annually, collected via direct observation or survey methods, using estimates in some cases to approximate impact across households.
Known Data Limitations	Number of people with economic benefits does not indicate the actual or relative size of the benefit, which may be a cash or non-cash benefit. Validity is good, integrity is high, reliability and timeliness are reasonable. Precision is variable across projects but should be consistent within projects.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established (should be zero)
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

Indicator	4.8.1-26 Number of hectares of biological significance and/or natural resources under improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance
Definition	“Improved natural resource management” includes activities that promote enhanced management of natural resources for one or more objectives, such as conserving biodiversity, sustaining soil or water resources, mitigating climate change, and/or promoting sustainable agriculture. Management should be guided by a stakeholder-endorsed process following principles of sustainable NRM and conservation, improved human and institutional capacity for sustainable NRM and conservation, access to better information for decision-making, and/or adoption of sustainable NRM and conservation practices. An area is considered under "improved management" when any one of the following occurs: a change in legal status favors conservation or sustainable NRM; a local site assessment is completed which informs management planning; management actions are designed with appropriate participation; human and institutional capacity is developed; management actions are implemented; ongoing monitoring and evaluation is established; adaptive management is demonstrated; or on-the-ground management impacts are demonstrated (eg. illegal roads closed, snares removed, no-fishing zones demarcated). Reported as total number of hectares improved during the fiscal year in question, which can include maintained improvement in previously reported hectares and/or new, additional hectares. A subset of this indicator may also be reported as “Number of hectares of natural resources showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance” if the latter indicator is used; double counting IS allowed. Higher = better Reported as total number of hectares improved during the fiscal year in question, which can include maintained improvement in previously reported hectares and/or new, additional hectares. Improved management should be reported for activities where the USAID supported program was plausibly linked to the improvements observed. Partners should articulate clearly the benchmarks that are being used within the program to gauge success, and provide a short narrative to describe the benchmarks that have been reached in the past year.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	A spatial indicator is an appropriate measure of the scale of impact of biodiversity conservation and/or NRM interventions. Good management of natural resources is a prerequisite for achieving improved biophysical condition of natural resources.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Hectares
Use of Indicator	Measures of this indicator demonstrate progress towards sustainable natural resources governance and institutions, and can inform adaptive management of programs. This indicator is a reliable annual measure that demonstrates the magnitude of USG investments in biodiversity conservation and other natural resource sectors.

Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Implementing partner(s) report the number of hectares under improved natural resources management annually based on the spatial impact of management improvements which were designed, adopted or implemented, including monitoring and adaptive management practices.
Known Data Limitations	Validity, integrity and reliability of data are high but regular data quality analysis is necessary. Precision is low: “improved management” is a relative term, and narrative is required to explain the quality of this management improved. Equal weight is given to unequal improvements along a continuum: eg. creating, adopting and implementing management plans may each be an improvement over a baseline. Likewise, a small management improvement across a large area may be as important as a large improvement across a small area.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.8.1-28 Number of days of USG funded technical assistance in natural resources management and/or biodiversity provided to counterparts or stakeholders
Definition	The provision of goods or services to developing countries and other USAID recipients in direct support of a development objective-as opposed to the internal management of the foreign assistance program. Services could include the transfer of knowledge and/or expertise by way of staff, skills training, research work and financing to support quality of program implementation and impact, support administration, management, representation, publicity, policy development and capacity building. Technical assistance includes both human and institutional resources. Technical assistance does not include financial assistance. Natural resources and biodiversity is defined as conserving biodiversity and managing natural resources in ways that maintain their long-term viability and preserve their potential to meet the needs of present and future generations. Activities include combating illegal and corrupt exploitation of natural resources and the control of invasive species. Programs in this element should be integrated with the Agriculture Area under Economic Growth and Conflict Mitigation and Reconciliation Area under the Peace and Security Objective, when applicable and appropriate.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Technical assistance supports institutional capacity building, a key goal for long term sustainability.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of days of technical assistance provided in each reporting period. Rounded up or down into whole numbers.
Use of Indicator	To convey the coverage and capacity building contribution of USG programs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reporting by implementing partners on an annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Validity: This indicator addresses only one of the limitations – exposure to concepts and systems that offer solutions to development problems or institutional gaps -- that prevent people from taking appropriate actions. Precision: Simply knowing the number of person days of technical assistance provided does not provide information about the quality and appropriateness of the technical advice provided
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of people trained resulting from a project.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.8.1-29 Number of person hours of training in natural resources management and/or biodiversity conservation supported by USG assistance
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: $\text{Hours of USG supported training course} \times \text{Number of people completing that training course}$ Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training. Natural resources and biodiversity is defined as conserving biodiversity and managing natural resources in ways that maintain their long-term viability and preserve their potential to meet the needs of present and future generations. Activities include combating illegal and corrupt exploitation of natural resources and the control of invasive species. Programs in this element should be integrated with the Agriculture Area under Economic Growth and Conflict Mitigation and Reconciliation Area under the Peace and Security Objective, when applicable and appropriate.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number (of person hours)
Use of Indicator	Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Attendance records of implementing partners that conduct training. Data are reported to the mission on a quarterly/annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Attendance records may be incomplete or inaccurate, especially in the case of determining whether a participant <i>completed</i> an entire course. The universe of countries providing this type of training can vary from year to year; thus, trends should not be interpreted from aggregate data.

Baseline Timeframe	The universe of countries contributing to this indicator varies from year to year based on mission goals and budget; thus, the baseline is established by each country when this type of training begins.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

4.8.2 - Clean Productive Environment

Indicator	4.8.2-6 Person hours of training completed in climate change supported by USG assistance
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: $\text{Hours of USG supported training course} \times \text{Number of people completing that training course}$ Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives to impart knowledge and information to USAID staff and stakeholders on climate change adaptation or mitigation. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Tracking the number of person hours of training provides information about the reach and scale of training and capacity building efforts. Training activities strengthen agency and in-country capacity, as well as promote strategic partnerships. They improve the likelihood that development partners will continue to implement relevant projects after USG support has ended, as well as increase the likelihood that agency staff will program climate change funds effectively, for maximum impact, and in compliance with Congressional earmarks/directives and Agency strategy, as well as integrate climate change considerations into other programs.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of person hours of training in each reporting period.
Use of Indicator	To convey the coverage and capacity building contribution of USG programs
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reporting by implementing partners using standard M&E procedures on an annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Validity: This indicator addresses only one of the limitations, necessary skills and knowledge that prevent people from taking certain actions to deal with climate change. It may not translate to action unless other issues are also addressed. Precision: Simply knowing the number of people does not reflect the depth of skills and knowledge conveyed, or capacity to act.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of people trained resulting from a project.
Disaggregate(s)	Clean Energy men

	• Clean Energy women • Adaptation men • Adaptation women • Sustainable landscapes men • Sustainable landscapes women • General climate change men • General climate change women
--	--

Indicator	4.8.2-10 Amount of investment leveraged in U.S. dollars, from private and public sources, for climate change as a result of USG assistance
Definition	Funding leveraged, as a result of USAID assistance, for climate change programs, including REDD+, that support actions, activities, projects or programs that reduce or sequester GHGs or increase capacity to adapt to the impacts of climate variability and change. Funding may be leveraged from the public sector (e.g., other donors) or private sector financing (e.g., corporate investments) and must be additional to USG funds invested in a program and must advance the objectives established by the USG-supported program. Leveraged funds can include funding transferred to a common funding instrument, delivered in parallel or provided in-kind. Examples of what leveraged funds may support include improving the enabling environment necessary for the program to succeed, funding the costs of activities advanced by the program, publicizing program results, monitoring program progress and/or outcomes, or sensitizing stakeholders to climate risks, REDD+ issues and opportunities addressed through the program. The indicator narrative should indicate the source of funds, for example, ODA or Non-ODA, partner government, private sector, multilateral, other bilateral, foundation, etc.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	USG funds are intended to be catalytic and to have sustainable benefits. Sustained private investment is a positive indicator of a supportive enabling environment. Good programs should attract additional investments, or test hypotheses as to the most effective strategies, techniques, and/or necessary capacities for addressing climate change. If successful, funds for scaling up or replicating results should be mobilized, whether from domestic or international sources.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	U.S. dollars
Use of Indicator	This indicator can be used for project level monitoring and evaluation, to track national progress to address climate change, and for reporting on the progress of the GCCI as a whole. Aggregated investment will be noted at UNFCCC international climate change negotiations, will be used to capture the impact of USAID's GCC portfolio for domestic and international audiences.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Project implementers will gather data about funding leveraged by through standard reporting procedures, such as quarterly and annual reports.
Known Data Limitations	Proprietary information – some organizations providing funding may consider some information on their funding support proprietary Precision – measuring funding leveraged does not necessarily indicate the magnitude of impact or results achieved
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline needs to be established by individual activity at start of a program.
Disaggregate(s)	• Clean energy public sector investments, • Clean energy private sector investments • Adaptation public sector investments, • Adaptation private sector investments, • Sustainable Landscapes (including REDD+) public sector investments, • Sustainable landscapes private sector investments, • General climate change public sector investments, • General climate change private sector investments

Indicator	4.8.2-14 Number of institutions with improved capacity to address climate change issues as a result of USG assistance
Definition	Institutions with improved capacity will be better able to govern, coordinate, analyze, advise, or make decisions related to adaptation, clean energy, or sustainable landscapes (e.g., REDD+). “Improvement” can be ascertained using an assessment of capabilities compared with a baseline assessment. Relevant institutions might include public sector entities (ministries, departments, working groups, etc.), private sector entities, community groups (women’s groups, CBOs or NGOs, farmers’ or fishing groups), trade unions, or others. For assessing capabilities, some proxies of institutional capacity to engage with climate change adaptation, clean energy, or sustainable landscapes (including REDD+) could include, but would not be limited to: • Providing input to relevant assessment or planning exercises, • Having certified or technically trained staff, • Engaging with stakeholders to ensure that policies, plans, budgets and investments reflect local realities and ensure that local communities benefit from climate change efforts and investments, • Having access to equipment or other inputs necessary for planning, assessment and management of climate change topics, or • Collaborating with scientists and policymakers, or hosting workshops involving relevant sectors or themes (e.g., agriculture, environment, forestry, energy, and water) to engage with climate change assessments, plans, or activities. The narrative accompanying this indicator should describe the nature and extent of capacity built, and the institution(s) involved. If a project builds capacity of the same two institutions from one year to the next, the same number should be reported each year.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Capable institutions are critical for coordinating, planning and engaging with climate change issues. Improved governance is an element of all three pillars of the climate change initiative. It is the second area of emphasis out of three under the adaptation pillar.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of institutions.
Use of Indicator	This indicator will be used to track to what extent institutional capacity building enables successful climate change programs, and to indicate the coverage of GCCI efforts.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Project implementers will gather data about institutions with improved climate change capacity through standard M&E procedures, such as quarterly and annual reports. A baseline assessment of institutions’ capabilities should be considered, which can be updated over the course of the project at regular intervals.
Known Data Limitations	Precision: This indicator does not indicate effectiveness, only engagement and coverage. Narrative description is important.

Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is start year of project. An initial assessment can be conducted or other sources used to evaluate institutions' capabilities to deal with climate change.
Disaggregate(s)	• Clean energy capabilities • Adaptation capabilities • Sustainable Landscapes, e.g., REDD+ capabilities • General climate change capabilities

Indicator	4.8.2-26 Number of stakeholders with increased capacity to adapt to the impacts of climate variability and change as a result of USG assistance
Definition	Adaptive capacity is the ability to adjust to climate change, to moderate potential damages, to take advantage of opportunities, or to cope with the consequences. USG support to increase adaptive capacity should aim beyond only the near term, to also have benefits in the middle and longer term. An increase in adaptive capacity can be shown with the use of surveys or assessments of capacities. Having the “ability to adjust” to climate change impacts will measure an objective of the project to deal with climate stresses (in the context of other stresses). Stakeholders with improved adaptive capacity may be: • Implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change, for example: • Implementing water-saving strategies to deal with increasing water stress • Making index-based micro-insurance available to assist farmers in dealing with increasing weather variability • Adjusting farming practices like soil management, crop choice, or seeds, to better cope with climate stress • Implementing education campaigns to promote the use of risk reducing practices, like use of storm shelters and bed nets that help people cope with climate stress Using climate information in decision making, for example: • Utilizing short term weather forecasts to inform decision-making, for example, by farmer cooperatives, disaster or water managers • Utilizing climate projections or scenarios to inform planning over medium to longer term timescales, for example, for infrastructure or land use planning • Conducting climate vulnerability assessment to inform infrastructure design or planning as “due diligence” This indicator relates most closely to two of the three main categories under the adaptation pillar: support for improved information and analysis, and implementation of climate change strategies. The narrative accompanying this indicator should describe adaptive capacity in the project context and indicate the stakeholders involved.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator is a measure of stakeholders’ abilities to understand, plan, and act as climate stresses evolve. The ability to deal with climate change will depend on awareness, information, tools, technical knowledge, organization, and financial resources, which are partly captured by this indicator.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Stakeholders, as defined by the project (e.g., individuals, decision-makers, or organizations).
Use of Indicator	These results will help to estimate the coverage and effectiveness of

	USAID's portfolio.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data for this indicator should come from project documentation about activities and stakeholders engaged, ideally validated by surveys or interviews to ensure the use, retention, and continuation of risk-reducing measures, information use, or other forms of adaptive capacity Project implementers should gather data about stakeholder's capacities through standard M&E procedures, such as quarterly and annual reports. A baseline survey or assessment of capabilities should be updated over the course of the project at regular intervals.
Known Data Limitations	Reliability: Consistent methods should be used from year to year to capture this indicator. Timeliness: Projects may not be able to report on this indicator in terms of actual use of information or implementation of risk reducing practices in initial years.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project
Disaggregate(s)	- Implementing risk-reducing practices or actions to improve resilience to climate change - Using climate information in decision making

Indicator	4.8.2-27 Number of days of USG funded technical assistance in climate change provided to counterparts or stakeholders
Definition	The provision of goods or services to developing countries and other USAID recipients in direct support of a development objective-as opposed to the internal management of the foreign assistance program. Services could include the transfer of knowledge and/or expertise by way of staff, skills training, research work and financing to support quality of program implementation and impact, support administration, management, representation, publicity, policy development and capacity building. Technical assistance includes both human and institutional resources. Technical assistance does not include financial assistance.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Technical assistance supports institutional capacity building, a key goal for long term sustainability.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of days of technical assistance provided in each reporting period. Rounded up or down into whole numbers.
Use of Indicator	To convey the coverage and capacity building contribution of USG programs.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Reporting by implementing partners on an annual basis
Known Data Limitations	Validity: This indicator addresses only one of the limitations, exposure to concepts and systems that offer solutions to development problems or institutional gaps that prevent people from taking appropriate actions. Precision: Simply knowing the number of person days of technical assistance provided does not provide information about the quality and appropriateness of the technical advice provided.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of people trained resulting from a project.
Disaggregate(s)	N/A

Indicator	4.8.2-28 Number of laws, policies, strategies, plans, agreements, or regulations addressing climate change (mitigation or adaptation) and/or biodiversity conservation officially proposed, adopted, or implemented as a result of USG assistance
Definition	Policies, laws, strategies, plans, agreements and regulations include those developed and formally endorsed by governmental, non-governmental, civil society, and/or private sector stakeholders to address climate change and/or biodiversity conservation issues. However, if a measure is not yet adopted, it must at least be formally proposed within an official government process to be reported. Legal, regulatory and policy reform has a role to play by incentivizing investment in clean energy or energy efficiency, or encouraging lower risk behavior. Depending on the context, regulatory and policy reform might include: zoning regulations to prevent development in flood-prone areas, standards for improved infrastructure, policies to conserve or allocate energy or water more effectively, regulations to encourage the development of renewable energy sources, or trans-boundary agreements related to the use of shared resources, among many others. For example, an officially proposed or adopted low-emission development strategy (LEDS) is one type of strategy that should be counted. Policies, laws, strategies, plans, agreements and regulations that address climate change and/or biodiversity conservation may be integrated in scope (e.g., at a certain spatial scale or political boundary such as municipal, state, or national), or may address certain climate-relevant sectors like water, marine resources, forests, land use and agriculture, energy, and urban development. For policies that may affect climate or biodiversity indirectly, it is essential that the indicator narrative explains the connection. For interpretation of this indicator, a qualitative description should be provided to explain what the number represents, particularly: • What is the title of the measure? • At what stage is it? (e.g., officially proposed, adopted, or implemented?) • How does the measure contribute to climate change mitigation or adaptation or biodiversity conservation? • What is/are the institution(s) that will be implementing and/or enforcing the measure, and at what scale (e.g., national, state, municipal, community)?
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	An improved enabling environment through legal and policy reform, strategy development and planning is essential for ensuring that efforts and investments in climate change have legal and strategic backing and institutional ownership.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of laws, policies, strategies, plans, agreements or regulations
Use of Indicator	This indicator can be used for project level monitoring and evaluation, to track national progress to address climate change, and for reporting on the

	progress of the GCCI as a whole.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data provided by project partners and/or implementers on a quarterly and annual basis through standard reporting procedures. Annual data should be reported.
Known Data Limitations	Validity: If the intended result is an improved enabling environment, then the numbers of policies, laws, regulations, and procedures provides only a partial measure of success, given that effective implementation and enforcement are also critical. Laws, policies, and plans might also not be well-designed or effective. Narrative is critical for interpreting this indicator. Timeliness: Preparatory studies may be required prior to proposal, adoption, or implementation of the measure Precision: This indicator does not capture progress made along the way in terms of convening stakeholders, drafting, approving, and implementing/enforcing laws, policies and plans. Narrative is critical for interpreting this indicator.
Baseline Timeframe	The baseline needs to be established by individual activity at the start of a program.
Disaggregate(s)	• Clean energy related measure, • Adaptation related measure, • Sustainable Landscapes related measure, • Cross-cutting measure related to multiple climate change areas or other sectors.